



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>





600102020B







JUDGMENT OF THE JUDGES OF JEHOVAH:

OR,

THE RATIONALISM OF ULTRA-CALVINISM REPUDIATED.

A VINDICATION

OF

THE WISDOM, WILL, AND SOVEREIGN RIGHT OF GOD,
IN SETTING THE GOSPEL PROFFER
BEFORE THE NON-ELECT:

IN WHICH,

THE EVIL OF STRAINING THOSE CALVINISTIC TRUTHS
CALLED THE DOCTRINES OF SOVEREIGN GRACE IS MADE
STARTLINGLY MANIFEST:

THE

ALL-SUFFICIENCY OF THE GRAND WORK OF CHRIST
AS THE JUST GROUND FOR THE
PROGRESS OF THE FATHER'S PURPOSE INCONTROVERTIBLY
DEMONSTRATED:

THE

ANTAGONISTIC DEDUCTIONS OF NATURAL
REASON WEIGHED IN THE BALANCES AND FOUND WANTING:
AND THE RULE OF INSPIRATION
AS THE SOLE GUIDE IN ALL AGES OF THE MINISTRY,
REASSERTED AND ENFORCED.

BY

WILLIAM ROBERTSON AIKMAN

SERVANT

OF

THE P. R. BAPTIST CHURCHES.



LONDON: HOULSTON AND SONS, PATERNOSTER BUILDINGS.

1875.

130. 2. 179.



TO THE
SPIRITUAL ZEBULON AND NAPHTALI,
THE SANCTIFIED PEOPLE,
WHO FOR THE GLORY OF GOD AND TRUTH OF HIS WORD,
JEOPARDIZE LIFE UNTO THE DEATH
IN THE HIGH PLACES OF THE FIELD,
This Demonstration,
VINDICATIVE OF THAT PART OF THE DIVINE PURPOSE
IN HEADING THE EXECUTION OF WHICH
THE CAPTAIN OF THE LORD'S HOST HIMSELF FELL,
IS IN THE GREAT AND INCOMMUNICABLE NAME
OF JENOVAN,
BY A SPEARMAN OF THE HOUSE OF DAVID
IN VERY FAITHFULNESS INSCRIBED.

EXALT YE THE LORD.

1

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION : THE FOOTPRINTS OF PROVIDENCE.	vii

PART FIRST.

THE ARGUMENT AGAINST THE SOVEREIGN COUNSEL OF JEHOVAH BROUGHT INTO JUDGMENT.

CHAPTER I.

THAT ANTISCRIPITURAL TEACHING, WHICH WITH A VIEW TO SUBVERT ONE GRAND PART OF THE SOVEREIGN PURPOSE OF GOD IN THE MINISTRY HAS ON THE EXCLUSIVE WARRANT OF NATURAL REASON BEEN ADVANCED, EXAMINED AND EFFECTUALLY REFUTED -	1
--	---

CHAPTER II.

THAT EXTRAORDINARY THEORY, BY WHICH THE ANTISCRIPITURAL TEACH- ING IN THE PREVIOUS CHAPTER REFUDIATED HAS WITH A VIEW TO ITS JUSTIFICATION BEEN UNAVAILINGLY BACKED, THOROUGHLY SCRUTINIZED AND EXPLODED -	27
---	----

CHAPTER III.

THAT INCOMPREHENSIBLE STANDARD WHICH AS A TEST OF MINISTERIAL SOUNDNESS IN THE TRUTH HAS ON THE STRENGTH OF THE FOREGOING TEACHING AND THEORY BEEN SET UP, EXAMINED AND MOST RIGHTEOUSLY REJECTED. -	56
---	----

CHAPTER IV.

THAT INDEFENSIBLE PRACTICE OF NOT MINISTERING THE GOSPEL AS BY GOD COMMANDED, IN SUPPORT OF WHICH THE ABOVE TEACHING, THEORY, AND STRANGE STANDARD HAVE BEEN DEVISED, TRACED; AND THE PRO- BABLE PERIOD OF ITS RISE, AND WHOLE AMOUNT OF AUTHORITY IN ITS FAVOUR, EXHIBITED. -	74
--	----

PART SECOND.

THE ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE SOVEREIGN COUNSEL OF JEHOVAH UNFOLDED.

CHAPTER I.

THAT AUGMENTED RESPONSIBILITY WHICH BY VIRTUE OF THE FREE PROF- FER OF THE GOSPEL ACCRUES TO THE NON-ELECT, DEMONSTRATED: AND THE SUBSTANCE OF THE DIVINE REQUIREMENTS UPON WHICH THAT RESPONSIBILITY IS DECREED TO REST, MADE UNDENIABLY MANI- FEST. -	81
---	----

CHAPTER II.

PAGE

THAT STRANGE THEOLOGICAL ERROR, ON THE STRENGTH OF WHICH THE
DIVINE REQUIREMENTS SET FORTH IN THE PREVIOUS CHAPTER HAVE
BEEN REPUDIATED, AND THE AUGMENTED OR EVANGELICAL RESPONSIBILITY
OF THE NON-ELECT DENIED, EXAMINED AND EXPLODED - - 124

CHAPTER III.

THAT ETERNAL PRINCIPLE, ON WHICH IN HIS EVANGELICAL DEALING WITH
THE NON-ELECT THE PROCEDURE OF JEHOVAH IS BASED, UNFOLDED: AND
THE IMPOSSIBILITY THAT THE ACCIDENT OF THE FALL SHOULD AVAIL
TO ANNIHILATE ANY PART OF THE MORAL OBLIGATION INCUMBENT ON
CREATURE OR CREATOR, DEMONSTRATED. - - - 143

CHAPTER IV.

THAT HIGHLY IMPERFECT VIEW, WHICH IN CONTEMPLATING THE GRAND
COVENANT OF SALVATION IS PECULIAR TO CALVINISTIC DIVINES, EXHIBITED:
AND THE IMPOSSIBILITY THAT THE VOUCHSAFEMENT OF GRACE
TO THE ELECT SHOULD AVAIL TO EXCLUDE THE REQUIREMENTS OF EQUITY
IN THE NON-ELECT, DEMONSTRATED. - - - 162

CHAPTER V.

THAT ALL-SUFFICIENCY IN THE GRAND WORK OF CHRIST, WHICH CONSTITUTES
IT A RIGHTEOUS GROUND ON WHICH TO CARRY OUT THE WHOLE
COUNSEL OF GOD IN THE MINISTRY, TRIUMPHANTLY DEMONSTRATED:
AND THE POSITION ASSUMED BY JEHOVAH, AS MOST UNCOMPROMISINGLY
LAID DOWN IN THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, HENCEFORTH AND FOR EVER
RENDERED IMPREGNABLE. - - - 187

APPENDIX.

SECTION FIRST.

THE POWER AND FAITHFULNESS OF JEHOVAH, AS DEEPLY INTERESTED TO
CONFIRM THE JUST USE OF HIS GENERAL EXHORTATIONS, ASSERTED:
AND THE SUBSTANCE OF A TRUE OR POWERFUL EVANGELICAL MINISTRY
TO THE NON-ELECT, SET FORTH AND FROM THE SCRIPTURES ESTABLISHED. 241

SECTION SECOND.

NOTES ON A HIGHLY INDECOROUS ARTICLE, BY SOME ANONYMOUS
WRITER PUBLISHED IN THE MAGAZINE CALLED "GOSPEL STANDARD,"
IN THE MONTH OF DECEMBER, 1871. - - - 254

SECTION THIRD.

THE FINAL SENTIMENT OF MR. PHILPOT, WITH RESPECT TO THE OBLIGATION
OF SETTING FORTH CHRIST AS THE EXTERNAL OBJECT OF FAITH,
EXHIBITED: AND THAT SENTIMENT SHOWN TO BE, THE SIMPLE RECURRENT
OF AN ORIGINAL CONVICTION. - - - 271

SECTION FOURTH.

NOTES ON A SECOND HIGHLY REPREHENSIBLE ARTICLE, BY SOME ANONYMOUS
WRITER PUBLISHED IN THE MAGAZINE CALLED "GOSPEL STANDARD,"
IN THE MONTH OF MAY, 1873. - - - 283

INTRODUCTION :

THE FOOT-PRINTS OF PROVIDENCE.

IN commending to the High Calvinistic Baptist Churches the following solemn protest against an unauthorized usage of the ministry, it has as a preliminary measure seemed expedient, that I should make known the several links in the chain of providence by which, in absolute contempt of the determinations of *my own* will, this work has by the hand of God been thrust upon me.

In the spring of the year 1857, I was, at the pressing instances of a ministerial friend whom I had known in Scotland, induced to make proof, as a sphere for my evangelistic labour, of Wiltshire. I had at that time been about seven years engaged in the work of the ministry, throughout which, be it expressly observed, it had never been my practice to preach with immediate design to administer *comfort*: the absorbing desire of my soul being, first, the conversion through divine grace of careless sinners to God; and secondly, their sanctification by the Spirit, unto consecration and the obedience of love. Thus labouring, about autumn of the same year I went for the first time to Devizes, to preach in the Independent Chapel. The morning discourse, it would appear, had stirred up considerable excitement; had caused during the interval of public worship no little discussion, mingled it may be, with expressions of dissatisfaction. Some knowledge of this circumstance had been conveyed to an aged deacon and others of the Church called the Old Baptist, and the true cause of the excitement being suspected, he and they took occasion to attend the evening service at the Independent Chapel: of which the result was, that a day or two subsequently I received an invitation in the name of the Church to preach.

Let the reader here be pleased to observe, that the aged deacon, Slade, to whom reference has been made, was, as is well known,

one of the very strictest of the sect called Particular, or High Calvinistic Baptists. That old man, when not himself preaching, was invariably present at my ministrations to the Church, and always expressed his satisfaction in listening to the truths enunciated. The fact then is clearly established, that before I had any personal knowledge of the Churches in question, I was diligently engaged in making manifest *the spiritual substance of the gospel*—called “*the doctrines of sovereign grace*.” For else, why by one of the very strictest in the belief of that way, and his brethren, was I called to minister the Word of God in their midst?

The invitation to which I have alluded, I for three reasons felt it necessary to decline. The first, a report which many make it their business to circulate against these Calvinistic Churches, to wit, that they are of purely Antinomian persuasion. The second, a further report which had reached me, viz., that the only preaching esteemed by these brethren was that, which had for its exclusive object to administer comfort to the regenerate—to souls already made manifest as the redeemed of Christ. The third, a still further report to the effect, that in these Churches the free preaching of the gospel to the unconverted was strictly forbidden. With respect to these several reports, the first, I have found to be a gratuitous slander; though doubtless, men with a mere head-knowledge of doctrine, and purely Antinomian spirit, may be found here and there in their midst: but with regard to the two last, I have, I am bound to say, found them substantially true. By reason therefore of these reports, I felt it necessary, or in plain words a matter of Christian integrity, to decline the invitation tendered.

A few days subsequently, the managing deacon of the Old Baptist Chapel, Mr. Carter, in company with Dr. Fowler of Trowbridge, a gentleman with whom, through my preaching in the Church of which he was a deacon I had contracted a slight acquaintance, waited on me at Bradford; when Mr. Carter so strenuously pressed the wish of his Church, that I was constrained to consent to occupy the pulpit for a single Lord's day: if memory serve me faithfully, candidly giving him to understand, that I firmly believed *one* would be ample to terminate my connexion with his Churches: at which the old gentleman laughed, and said, he with equal firmness believed that it would not. He proved to be right: I continued to labour among these Churches (excepting only a year spent in the Lord's work in Ireland, and a few months in the Shetland Islands) until the autumn of 1865, when I embarked for the East, with a view to *lay the gospel before the Mahommedans*.

When I began to have personal acquaintance with the members of these Churches, I found not a few, the godliness of whose minds I could have no valid reason to doubt, who seemed exceedingly weak in faith—heavily clouded in hope—altogether darkened and disconsolate in mind. After long and attentively considering the case, I came to the conclusion,* that that comfort which heretofore I had not been in the habit of preaching, considered as an instrument to meet and counteract a certain well-known tendency of the burdened spirit to despond,—an instrument also to weaken the hands of the great adversary in tempting advanced but deeply exercised Christians to doubt their state,—might in some particular instances prove highly beneficial. In consequence of this conclusion, I began to make a point of exhibiting any comfort which in addition to its other matter was fairly to be evolved from the text: my hope being, that the Lord might of his mercy see fit to sanctify it, to meet the above exigences. At the same time (to give the result of my personal experience) I confess, that I have never found the preaching of comfort of much use or adaptation to my own case in the hour of trial. But while thus cautiously endeavouring to make use of the ministry for the purpose specified, I never dreamed of abandoning my divinely delegated right to preach the gospel of Christ to *sinner*s; nor forego the necessary duty of laying down, as an infallible consequent on divine faith, *the sanctifying power of the Holy Spirit in the soul*. (Acts xv. 9.) And forasmuch as not actually resisted in bearing witness to that which my conscience ratified as the undoubted truth of God, I continued with the Churches in question until my departure for India.

Let the reader here again be pleased to observe, that my being among the Particular Redemption Baptists as the servant of their Churches, was not through personal *choice*, but the constraining of brethren: in other words, by stress of providence rather than my own desire or seeking.

But at this point it is highly necessary to state, that throughout the whole period of my ministration in these Churches, (*with*

* The more in the light of Truth I have considered this matter, the more thoroughly I have become convinced, that it comes to pass through a systematic excluding from the High Calvinistic Baptist Churches of all reference to that FAITH, which by Paul and Luther was so incessantly preached. That is, instead of the ministry setting forth Christ as the adamant Rock or Resting-place by a merciful God laid down for the contrite, a series of emotions (only) have been continually exhibited. Of which the consequence is, that a hearer who at the moment judges that he has such emotions, becomes wonderfully elated; but as soon as these emotions again change, the same party becomes equally downcast and dispirited. (See Appendix, Section Third.)

the eye of my soul upon many explicit passages of Scripture, some of these the very weightiest to be found in the Bible), I never could feel thoroughly satisfied with one thing which I found in their midst : to wit, the very sweeping conclusion to which they have come, that because predestination and the strict substitution of Christ for the elect are absolute truths, therefore, in no sense whatever is the sacrifice of Christ by the eye of Jehovah beheld as having reference to the non-elect ; who, (for thus by necessity is the logical conclusion) have no conceivable responsibility in connexion with that transaction. Now this, is the actual ground on which, in open contempt of the imperial mandate of Jehovah, the obligation to preach the gospel to the masses is in the P. R. Baptist Churches disregarded. But, granting as divine those passages which in connexion with the non-elect are so solemnly revealed—granting them to stand in the Bible by express inspiration of the Holy Spirit—I felt inwardly satisfied, that in the conclusion to which on this point my Baptist brethren had come, they must be mistaken. But to say that I found the point easy to clear, would not only be untrue, but would, as contradicted by the experience of all the ablest theologians that have ever lived, be open to most righteous suspicion. For the whole band of the later theologians of the Calvinistic Churches of the Reformation, either openly or tacitly admit this, among others, to be a point fraught with insuperable difficulty—clouded with what to the natural apprehension will still appear to be, contradiction and perplexing inconsistency. If I were then to affirm that I have found the point easy to settle, I should be guilty of absolute falsehood. That I felt the conclusion very generally advocated by Calvinistic divines, to wit, that the non-elect have no real connection with the Work of Christ, to be by the above-mentioned deeply solemn passages of Scripture absolutely invalidated, is certain. But how to get at that sublimer truth which I felt conscious must be hidden somewhere, was a difficulty with which, until I had been nearly twenty years in the divine life, I could not satisfactorily deal. Moreover, being during those years continually engaged in travel and preaching, I found not that leisure and seclusion indispensable to prayerful and prevalent research. Notwithstanding every such hindrance, however, I continued to be kept anxiously—nay ! oftentimes even painfully pondering.

Once, under the impression that that godly gentleman, the late Mr. George Hunt, of Bath, was a man of reflection, I transmitted him some thoughts in connection with this subject ; and received two very excellent, I might even say weighty letters in reply. Of which the substance was, That granting the unquestionable difficulty of the point, and of many scriptures which

immediately bear upon it, yet the peculiarity of Christ's atonement (*which he evidently conceived to be of the nature of an exact payment by the Divine Being of a certain amount of creature debt*) was to his mind conclusive. That is, he believed that the Eternal Father had carefully estimated, and in His wisdom decided, that a certain amount of suffering if inflicted on a Divine Substitute would discharge the debt, or atone for the legal responsibility of the elect. And this exact amount of suffering having been duly laid on Christ, the responsibility of the elect had in equity been met, and their debt discharged. This exposition of the Work of Christ greatly differs from that of Dr. Owen, who contrary to almost all other theologians contends, that Christ suffered the *very punishment* which by the penalty of the law was denounced against the guilty; the "*idem*," or exact thing which, but for His intervention, his people must have borne. Dr. Gill in some passages seems to agree with Owen, making use of his very words and evidently taking him for a model; but in other passages, can only be interpreted upon the idea of Mr. Hunt, whose opinion may possibly be the most common in the P. R. Baptist Churches. These different shades of opinion, are, unquestionably, results of the struggles of the human mind with a theme so transcendently glorious, so infinitely exalted, as in many respects to baffle the very loftiest creature intelligence. But to proceed. The explication which had been submitted by Mr. Hunt, while it could not by removing the difficulty *satisfy*, had for a time as its effect, to still to some extent the *dissatisfaction* felt on this point. I may therefore say, that for a brief period, in default of the real interpretation which I could not but believe lay undiscovered somewhere, I was constrained to be satisfied with *that*; being inclined to look upon it as the conception *short* of truth, nearest the mark of all to which in this imperfect state the spirit of man had been privileged to attain. Not very long after, I set out for the work of the Lord in Hindostan.

What at this point I feel specially anxious that the reader should mark, is, that even by Calvinistic theologians of the very highest order, when attempting the extremely difficult task of unfolding the exact nature of the substitution of Christ, several distinct and differing shades of interpretation are adopted. That of the learned Owen is so utterly extravagant, that one who more entirely than all others cordially sympathizes with his view, the late Principal Cunningham, (called by some because of his bold and able defence of the Calvinistic tenets of his Church the sledge-hammer of Scotland), while greatly commending the excellence of the worthy Doctor's motive, is constrained as it were reluctantly to admit, that the view cannot upon the evidence

with any hope of success be maintained. There being then even among the greatest of Calvinistic theologians these varying shades of opinion, Who save God I ask is competent to decide, *which* is exactly right? Who is he that can certainly shew, which of all these deeply reflecting divines has entirely escaped misapprehension, and laid his hand upon the very secret of truth? Penetration thus nobly transcendent, is not of mind finite to be expected: hence the judgment in question is manifestly impossible. But while for judgment thus high it is clear, that no wisdom inferior to the Divine may by any possibility avail, yet a judgment more simple, more level to the limited capacity of the creature, remains; and to *that*, with the unerring Scripture in hand, we *may* I believe very safely advance. It is this; mark it: *that in some degree, greater or less, by divergence from the strict line of truth, ALL ARE WRONG.* This, from the very earliest period of my own personal investigation of the subject, has ever been the deep, the involuntary conviction of my mind; conviction, which, no consideration which might suggest itself has ever proved sufficient to eradicate. But why? To this I very plainly reply, *Because of the direct manner in which, either at one point or another, the explications by all these theologians submitted do openly clash with the Scriptures.* That is, the opinion by which they seek to explain the exact nature of the substitution, *will still in their despite contradict, nay! absolutely degrade or deny some other divinely revealed truth.* This fact is altogether decisive, or at least to my mind decisive, that in some important particulars such opinion *must* come short of the glorious reality; for revealed truth can by no possibility clash with revealed truth. But the views of the theologians *do* clash with plainly revealed portions of truth: their views, therefore, cannot be in *perfect accordance* with the Divine Mind. So certain as Jehovah himself is truth, there *must* be, yea, there *is* divergence somewhere. While then for lack of all-comprehending knowledge it must to the creature be a pure impossibility to decide which among our great Calvinistic theologians is certainly right, there seems to me to be ample evidence—evidence altogether indisputable and conclusive—upon which to bring in judgment *that all to a considerable extent are wrong.* Such the conviction—permanent, deep, ineradicable—of my own mind, at the period of my departure for Hindostan.

The plan which in contemplating the Lord's work in the East I had determined to adopt, was purely apostolic: viz., to proceed at once to the bazars and places of public resort, and preach to all within earshot the cross of Christ. Having in my youth *passed the college* as an interpreter of the Army, and indeed

been a very thorough one in my day, I cherished the hope that I should be able to commence labour almost as soon as landing. But I little knew the amazing extent to which seventeen years residence in England, without reading or opportunity for converse, had stripped me of my former efficiency. On putting matters to the proof, I found to my deep distress, not only that I could not accurately frame the commonest sentences, but that all skill in hearing had departed. I could neither express my own thoughts as I desired, nor understand those who submitted theirs. To make matters worse, I almost instantly fell a prey to low, corroding fever, the revived dregs of that which had broken my constitution years before, which like smouldering fire in the vein consumed me by night and by day; rendering study a labour altogether intolerable, and memory absolutely incapable of the work of retention. The consequence was, that all the plans which in *my wisdom* I had formed were entirely overthrown; and in spite of my heart I was obliged to resort to new measures. I now felt, that however laborious the operation, I should be obliged little by little to work out my thoughts on paper, and by means of the Press ultimately bring them to bear upon the proper parties. Very shortly after having thus by stress of circumstance been driven from my first resolution, it pleased the Lord (specially as I think) to open my eyes very clearly to see, that if the guile of the False Prophet was ever to be met and effectually dealt with, it must be by no ephemeral assay; but by laying axe to the very root of that deadly Upas from which, twelve hundred and fifty-five years before, the moral and religious pestilence called Islam had sprung. The result, after unexampled suffering—through sickness, anxiety, labour, temptation, heart-drooping, despair—was, a most triumphant refutation in the Hindostanee tongue, of the claims of Mahommed and THE KORAN.

But in preparing this refutation of THE KORAN, the grand desire of my soul was, that it should not merely be a swift witness against the counterfeit revelations of Mahommed, but a powerful instrument beside, to preach the gospel of Christ to the perishing: nay! more; an actual body, though in limited space, of Christian Divinity. To secure this design, the most momentous among many weighty considerations was, on the broad, the indisputable ground of the divine equity, to demonstrate the absolute necessity, first, *of an honourable atonement to the law for sin*; and secondly, *of the incarnation of the Deity, as indispensable to the constitution of that atonement*. If in the iron of such demonstration, as even the serpent-like wisdom of a Mahommedan should not be able to evade or gainsay these two things could be incontrovertibly established, I felt satisfied that to the apprehen-

sion of the most enthusiastic of its defenders, the real destitution of Islam *must*, however obstinately unacknowledged, stand nakedly and permanently revealed. It was all-important therefore to my plan, that a demonstration thus strong should be prepared and disseminated.

This part of the work necessarily brought me upon what I felt, and what by every regenerate mind will be admitted to be, awfully solemn ground. Let the reader, while for a moment I endeavour to sketch its solemnity, attend. It consisted in this,—that whereas from the very earliest period of my Christian researches, I had as already explained been pursued by the ineradicable conviction, that in the grand matter of the substitution of Christ, the several explications by our great Calvinistic theologians submitted were through collision with this or that plainly revealed truth of Scripture openly manifested to be wrong, yet hitherto, I myself had not been enabled to remove the veil, that the indubitable harmony pertaining to that divine transaction should be brought to light. Indeed, to my own mind, I seemed to be as far off as ever from ability to grasp the mystic clue. Yet now, in order to establish the double point so indispensable to an effectual refutation of the Koran, it had become absolutely necessary, that I myself should bring to issue and settle this most momentous, most truly baffling of themes. The time had at length arrived, when in presence of the whole Mahomedan world, I was, as Jehovah's witness, bound to testify to the atonement of his Son. In my own despite, I now found myself under necessity to overcome this important theological difficulty; to the end that as an instrument in the hand of God I should instruct nations, tribes, kindreds, and tongues, covering an area of the Eastern Hemisphere, even greater than all Christendom. In short, as a professed teacher of the ignorant, a guide to them that sit in darkness, I had now to lay down that which should claim to be the unadulterated truth of the Living God. It was, therefore, of the last importance that the work should be done correctly—in exact accordance with the mind of the revealing Spirit—in such a way that the sanction and blessing of God might permanently rest upon it. To His praise alone be it spoken, I felt, and very effectually felt, that no light, no trifling, no mere *party* matter was before me. In short, I was deeply, ay, painfully sensible, that no explication *ought* to be written, and upon the strength of that conviction came to the conclusion that none *should* be written, the absolute truth of which was not clearly made manifest, by its perfectly harmonizing with every other part of the revealed Word. Thus it was, that in the course of God's mysterious providence I was brought into a great strait ;

was once more (this time with all necessary leisure and seclusion) cast upon searching for the key by which to unlock this theological difficulty; cast upon prayer and the infallible Word, that I might find it. The Lord, who in that day of unutterable trial comprehended the nature and measure of my anxieties, had compassion: did Himself (as I firmly believe) open the eye of my mind, and enable me to see through and through that grave difficulty, which He had caused to weigh like a mountain upon my heart. By which mercy, on both points to which reference has been made, I was enabled to place before the Mahommedan world that effectual demonstration, which I felt to be indispensable to my ends.

Mark then, that that ultimate conclusion to which with regard to the Work of Christ I have been brought, agrees with every distinct truth unfolded in the Written Word; and of course embodies the grand fact, that the non-elect *have* to do—yea! in an awfully solemn sense have to do—with the unfathomable transaction of the Cross of Christ. But here I take occasion to say, that while for the establishing of Jehovah's will in the public preaching of the gospel, the explanation here submitted is all-sufficient, yet I could not for lack of space furnish a complete "Exposition of the Atonement." That would require a volume of itself: and such a volume—the Lord continuing to me the gifts of life and intellect—I intend at an early period to furnish. In the meantime, every plain truth which to facilitate righteous judgment in the matter at issue I have felt to be absolutely necessary, *that* I have very carefully set down.

Once more at this point I request the reader to take note, that lasting and deep though my dissatisfaction with existing opinion relative to the grand sacrifice of Christ had been, yet it was not that by which ultimately I was driven to extremity, and compelled to seek as one that must not fail to find, true interpretation for that most sublime of God's transactions. Nay! it was something far weightier: even the painful strait above described, into which, as into the meshes of a net, the hand of God had in the course of providence brought me.

But to proceed. The publication of the refutation in question, having completely cut me off from friendly intercourse with the Mahommedans, I began to feel (after having brought out an English edition of the same Work for the benefit of our college-trained, English-speaking Hindoos) that my labours in the East were accomplished; and that I should be more useful in the hand of God by returning to the work of the vineyard in England. But as my matured views with respect to the responsibility of the non-elect—with regard also to the Lord's design and

wisdom in the ordinance of the ministry—utterly differed from those of my brethren in the P. R. Baptist Churches, *I had, with a view to avoid what seemed to my mind UNNECESSARY COLLISION, firmly determined to seek for myself a distinct sphere of labour.* In pursuance of which design, only two days after debarking at the docks in London, I re-embarked by steamboat for the north of England, intending to commence labour in the populous district of Newcastle. I had sojourned in that city about a fortnight or three weeks, without much opportunity for proclaiming the Word, when to my great surprise I received a letter from one of the P. R. Baptist preachers, congratulating me upon my return to England, and hoping that I should soon return south and resume my labours among the Churches. This letter, I confess, did to no inconsiderable degree annoy me—as I had wished to remain private. But since it was a matter of Christian obligation that I should reply, I took occasion in answering it to explain, that I had no desire to re-commence ministering the Word in the P. R. Baptist Churches: the reasons being, first, that I was firmly determined to preach the gospel *to sinners*; and secondly, equally determined not to preach indiscriminate comfort *to saints*; my own fallen nature making me sensible of the fact, that rebuke and warning in their season were to the full as much, nay! even more necessary than comfort. To this communication, I for many days received no answer, and had begun to hope, that the candour of my declaration had put an end to all further correspondence. At length, however, arrived a second letter from Mr. Hemington: in which he gave me to understand, that on both the points specified he entirely coincided with my views; that being called to the pastorate in Devizes, and also in London, it would be a special favour if I would occupy the pulpit of the former church for two Lord's days approaching, to provide for which he found great difficulty; adding, that he should under the circumstances exceedingly regret my not acceding to his request. The extreme severity of a Northumbrian April after long residence in the tropics, had materially injured my respiratory organs: the few occasions moreover on which I had preached sufficed to shew, that the truths advanced found no acceptance in the thoroughly Arminianized city of Newcastle: for both reasons, my mind had been made up to return south, and seek work in a more genial climate. Being therefore for the moment disengaged, despite much very natural reluctance, I felt that I might not displease God by refusing to fill the gap to which Mr. Hemington pointed: hence wrote to say, that in order to meet the present exigency I *would* undertake the work in Devizes for the two sabbaths mentioned.

The day after I reached Town, I proceeded to Devizes; my intention being to remain as secluded as possible during the week, and after completing my engagement, at once look around for a distinct sphere. Once more, however, the wisdom of God seemed at determined antagonism with my design. For by reason of the burial of a gentleman for many years widely respected in the P. R. Baptist Churches, which took place in the immediate vicinity of Devizes that very week, I was, in spite of my determination to remain hid, brought in contact with sundry old friends; not only among the members, but preachers of this denomination, of whom, not a few had assembled to the obsequies.

Having completed my engagement in Devizes I returned to London, where I almost instantly received letters from Mr. Hemington desiring to see me, as he felt anxious to consult me with respect to the relation in which he stood to the Church in Devizes and in London. In accordance with this request, I waited on him at his lodgings; when among other things he proposed, that I should fill the pulpit of the Church in Gower Street during his next visit to Devizes. *This, under reference to the determination expressed in my letter from Newcastle, I positively declined.* It was of little use however on my part to decline, for Mr. Hemington had evidently made up his mind that I should not escape. Hence in vain did I plead the collision into which such a step must infallibly bring me with his Churches, for Mr. Hemington was inexorable; had resolved not to take No for an answer. Having therefore pressed the matter until I was ashamed, to avoid further contention, I at length consented to occupy the pulpit in London for a single Lord's day. He pressed me hard for two: but here I made a decisive stand, on the ground that one would suffice for the collision which I anticipated: and I further gave him to understand, that my first step on entering the pulpit must necessarily be, to make the Church acquainted with the determinations of which he was cognizant: a pledge which I failed not most faithfully to redeem.

Having accomplished this little service, I was again, despite my remonstrances, despatched by Mr. Hemington to Devizes; and again on my return constrained in his absence to occupy the gap in London. And thus, with occasional services in some other churches, passed a period of perhaps three months.

During all this time my preaching consisted of two distinct parts: the one to saints alone, the other exclusively to sinners. In either case, I feel competent to challenge every individual present to shew, that I preached by jot or by tittle aught differing from—*aught contrary to*—the preaching of the Son of God and

his Apostles : or to adduce a single utterance in which by the infallible oracles of Jehovah I was not altogether and to the uttermost justified. But supposing that upon the Written Word it can be shewn that I DID, *I consent to appear before the Church of Christ in Gower Street, and on the evidence of my deviation being made manifest, receive any amount of just censure, which as God's witness it may see fit to convey.*

At the end of about three months, it pleased a member of the last-named Church to assail that preaching, which, taking Christ and His Apostles as my exemplars, I so faithfully delivered in the ears of the unregenerate. League was made with a few sympathizing friends—hand-bills were struck—were freely distributed at the door of the Chapel. With one of these I myself was presented, as I entered the Chapel on the evening of Tuesday to preach.

At my leisure, I examined this hand-bill ; and, as may be judged, with no inconsiderable measure of surprise found as follows. First, that *that preaching to the unregenerate* which is by Jehovah most imperatively commanded, in which also the Lord Jesus Christ himself set His ministering servants the very brightest example, was boldly denounced as Arminianism. Secondly, that *that sanctification* which is in the Bible declared to be absolutely essential to saintship, which is witnessed also as an infallible accompaniment of justification, was represented as nothing more than the mere separating decree of election. Thirdly, that to the utter exclusion of Christ and his Apostles, *the names of four modern, uninspired preachers of the gospel*, were, as a righteous standard of appeal in such matters, set forth for the acceptance of the Churches. Small cause for wonder, then, that I should feel both disgust and profound contempt for the bill. Having shortly after again to occupy the pulpit for Mr. Hemington, I could scarcely fail to feel it incumbent on me, to vindicate the spiritual sanctification witnessed in the Bible ; ay ! demonstrate it to be something far nearer home, something by the blessed recipient proved to be far more experimental, than the decree of election ; to wit, *spiritually renewed affections, and the new obedience of love in the heart.* The text selected for the occasion was (1 Pet. i. 15, 16) : but the subject being vast, I found it necessary to divide the text into two discourses. It pleased the Lord, during the handling of this vital theme in the morning, to back me with a measure of power : I was enabled very effectually to unfold, exalt, and establish *the truth.* In the course of the sermon, also, *I took special care to repudiate that new standard of appeal for the Churches, which in the persons of the four uninspired men whose names had been printed, had in the place of*

Christ and the inspired Apostles been set up: and I announced that I should return to what remained of the subject in the evening. I had scarcely however entered the vestry, when one of the deacons, a particular friend of the person circulating the hand-bills, evidently in a highly excited state, and with no very elaborate courtesy of demeanour, made his appearance and requested, "That I would not introduce controversial and difficult subjects; subjects which the people could not understand; which moreover could do no good;" concluding by saying, "that he should esteem it a personal favour, if I would forbear to renew the discourse in the evening." *This wonderfully difficult subject was, GOSPEL HOLINESS, OR THAT NEW OBEDIENCE OF LOVE, WHICH IS THROUGH THE SPIRITUAL INDWELLING OF CHRIST.* After a moment's thought, I very calmly said, "Mr. Moore, the subject has this morning been so thoroughly, so incontrovertibly demonstrated, that no man may gainsay or deny it: as therefore the second discourse is not *absolutely* necessary, I'll oblige you; I'll take according to your wish another text." Mr. Moore thanked me, and retired.

During the interval of public worship, I reflected on the circumstance which had taken place. I clearly perceived that the party publishing the hand-bills had at least one friend among the office-bearers: and I seemed instinctively to apprehend the fact, that should I continue to preach, it would in all probability lead to dissension among the deacons, three of whom, at least, I knew to be favourable to my ministry. Disunion among these, I could not but foresee would be likely to extend to the body of the Church: I therefore came to the conclusion, that it would be better for me to retire, availing myself of the evening service to take leave of the congregation.

But in adopting this resolution, I felt that I had one more duty to perform,—single-handed, weak, insufficient though I could not but feel myself to be. That duty, I determined at every hazard to fulfil. Hence toward the close of the evening discourse, took occasion to set forth the imperative obligation of ministering the gospel as by Jehovah commanded: that is, *to sinners—to the masses.* And the persistent ignoring of that obligation, I failed not to charge home upon the Church—all such Churches—but especially their pastors and preachers—*as deliberate neglect of the will of God, and the purest one-sidedness.* The discourse being ended, I explained in few words the important reasons which had influenced me in deciding to resign my further engagements with the Church, and took my leave.

Once more ere proceeding further, I must beg the spiritual reader to mark, how singularly from the very moment of my

return from India up to this time, the Lord through stress of providence had ordained to countervail my most resolute determinations: *yea! frustrate that counsel of peace, which in heart I had virtually ratified.* For by a quiet unobtrusive departure from these Churches, and entry upon a fresh sphere of labour, I had sought to avoid that painful collision which, in the event of my ministering the Word in their midst, I felt to be inevitable. But that which in *my wisdom* I had judged it so desirable to prevent, the Lord in *His inscrutable counsels* had determined should not fail to have effect: hence, in the course of His unerring providence, took effectual measures to bring it to pass.

Shortly after my retirement from the service of the Church in Gower Street, the act of publishing and circulating the hand-bills was made a subject of public investigation: of which the result was, that the party who had taken thus much upon himself, to evade the reparation righteously demanded by the brethren, saw fit to resign his church-membership.

It is probable that this public censure, had the effect of stimulating to still further aggression; for some months later it pleased this person, to issue a pamphlet directed against one of the deacons who had taken a leading part in the enquiry which led to his resignation, and against myself. Of this pamphlet, a copy was transmitted to me, and is yet in my possession: its contents I have not to this day ascertained. The evening it reached me, however, in carelessly turning over its pages, I perceived that some passages in smaller type, headed "Mr. A. says," professed to be extracts from discourses which I had preached in Gower Street. At one or two of these I *did* glance, and found them mere fragments very carefully severed from their legitimate connexion, and these not given correctly. But while, as before stated, thus carelessly turning over the pages of the work, my eye by chance fell upon a name well-known in the P. R. Baptist Churches, the highly gifted possessor of which had some years before been removed to his rest. Its presence excited my curiosity: 'What *had* so respectable a name to do with the pamphlet which I held in my hand?' I examined the passage, and found a short extract from the printed works of the very eminent preacher bearing the name: an extract the substance of which, I will not hesitate to avouch, excited both regret and unmingled astonishment.

There remains but one thing more to state: it is this. After the issue of the hand-bill at the door of the Chapel and elsewhere, I was by parties in London and the country requested, in order to counteract the wrong impressions consequent on the falsehoods circulated, to issue a refutation of them. The maligner, however, *belonging to that class of persons of whom the befitting meed is,*

that they be left to their malice disregarded, I was, to the disappointment of many, precluded from interfering. On the subsequent issue of the pamphlet, I was again by several vehemently urged to the work of refutation. Though for the reason already stated it was a pure impossibility that I should yield to this request, yet the author of THE EXTRACT to which I have particularly alluded, belonging to a very different class of society and character, I had from the very instant in which my eye apprehended that Extract, seemed to feel it divinely pre-determined, that I should not in honour go down to the grave, until by the mill-stone of Revealed Truth I had ground it absolutely to powder. The result, after much hindrance by sickness, and other circumstances not essential to the thread of this narrative, is the present Volume.

From the several distinct links in the providential chain which I have here brought to light, the reader, if possessed of Christian discernment, or the subject of natural candour, will scarcely fail to perceive, that in these pages is not the mere seeking of conflict, but the execution of paramount duty. It was important that he *should* see this, that misapprehension being excluded, the solemn verities in connection with the divine glory which will here be unfolded, may find that consideration which so imperatively they demand. From the evidence now adduced then be it thoroughly understood, *that not in a vain or captious spirit have I here elected myself to a condemnatory labour*, BUT IN THE INSCRUTABLE WISDOM OF JEHOVAH, A CONDEMNATORY LABOUR HAS BEEN THRUST UPON ME.

With reference to the Work itself, it is perhaps indispensable to the completeness of this narrative to state, that but little more than one half of the original Manuscript appears. Since to the spiritually wise—to those who with admiration watch the faithfulness of the Divine Hand, who have moreover a personal interest in the Saviour's righteousness, the reason will doubtless prove both instructive and interesting—I feel it in a sense the very highest imperative, that it be recorded.

Observe then, that the first draught of this Work, of which the Appendix itself when entire formed a considerable volume, was finished about six months prior to the present; and I was about to commit it to the press. But in refuting the grave errors which will be found upon these pages, my mind had become so determinedly bent on obtaining full results, that I had entirely failed to appreciate the fearfully grinding nature of my demonstrations. The Lord, however, before whose eye even death and hell lie naked, had been less remiss; had scanned them through and through; and judging them by a mighty

degree too iron-handed, had determined in His sovereignty to withstand. Hence just as I was about to proceed with the work of printing, He bowed the heavens, and as a smoking flame came down for controversy. The more painful part of this contest, I have neither space nor inclination to record ; suffice it therefore to say, that the sum of the divine communication as by night and day incessantly borne in upon my mind, was simply this, "*That the Lord was not well pleased in the matter : hence it was vain to proceed : for He would not be with me.*" I will not however neglect to say, that I now had a decided presentiment as to what might possibly be the cause ; but, it did not please the Lord at this time, intelligibly to open up His mind. I therefore reasoned, and continued inwardly to reason the point : 'Lord is it not *thy truth* that I am defending : surely the word of God is worthy to be vindicated : is it not thine own revealed word ?' It was, however, of little use to reason ; for still, yet without vouchsafing any satisfactory explanation, the Lord stuck to His text : "*He was not well pleased in the matter, and He would not be with me.*" When the contest had lasted two or three days, I grew thoroughly vexed, became deeply dispirited, and began (but I admit, not by any means with the best grace) to fall in with what to sense and feeling *seemed* to be the manifest decision of God. Sullenly enough, of a truth, I said, "Very good, Lord, I am content : if thou carest not that thy truth be down-trodden, I can easily lay my labours on the shelf, or consign them to the flame : it is but another to the many wounds which have gone before—in which I have grown old—under which, also, I have to some extent become steeled." This ungracious assent to what at the moment certainly *appeared* to be the will of God, had as little effect on the Divine Being as the previous reasoning : still, yet without condescending to explain, He stuck diligently to His text : "*The Lord would not be with me ; for He was not well pleased in the matter.*" Finding out in soul-withering experience, that by either way I could make absolutely nothing of the case, I began to be keenly alive to the fact, that I was in a great and solemn strait ; could neither go forward, nor yet backward ; hence came to the simple conclusion, that I must just stand still, and with all caution, all diligence watch the hand of God, for an ordering of this matter by the rule of His own holy will. Meantime I *did*, I freely admit, consider myself somewhat hardly dealt with : *did* like the man Jonah think, that the tide of divine sovereignty had set in rather too strongly against me : and oftentimes the thought *would* recur, "Well, the Lord might at least have made this manifest a full year ago, and thus spared me in days of sickness and suffering many a weary midnight watch." Notwithstanding all which,

the Lord altered not : to my eminent discomfort, but still without vouchsafement of explanation, He stuck immovably to His text : "*The Lord was not well pleased ; and He would not be with me.*" The controversy had now lasted five or six days, perhaps more, and as yet gave no promise of drawing to a close : under the full misery of it, I on the evening of Saturday left Town for Hartley Row, Hampshire, to preach on the following Lord's day. That night there was no sign, no not a shadow, of any approaching change in the divine dealing ; and I retired to rest burdened with the same unsatisfactory and desolate feeling. On awaking in the morning, however, I at once apprehended a remarkable change in the Lord's attitude : and while yet in my private apartment dressing, the all-absorbing power of the Spirit fell upon me, and commenced to some extent to open up Jehovah's matter : but not on that occasion completely. The sum of the communication which under glorious light of His presence the Lord in the meantime saw fit to convey, was, "*That my hand had been awfully heavy ; heavier by far than I myself was aware ; that my crafty enemies in the Churches would make its very weight a convenient instrument by which to neutralize and malign the testimony : yea, would even seek to turn it against my own practical ministrations.*" This partial explication, accompanied as it was by the magnificent outflow of the Holy Spirit's grace, not only to the central soul softened and solemnized, but rendered me now in a high and spiritual sense entirely willing to anything, everything, which under the circumstances the Divine Majesty might deem most befitting. I therefore said, "Lord, I am truly agreed to any arrangement which Thou art pleased to ordain. Shall I altogether cast aside my demonstrations ? I care not for the loss of my labour : let be, that which is best. Shall I just leave the Churches as they are, and accepting all personal dishonour, simply hold my peace ?" To this, I received no immediate communication, save only the glorious experimental one, to wit, "*that the actual presence of the Lord was sufficient for me.*" In the rich light of that presence I went to the Chapel, where on entering the pulpit and during the time occupied in singing a long preliminary hymn, the Spirit of God descended in a deluge of glory—so overpowering, or, if I may use the expression, so all-devouring, that I could scarcely bear up under it. The revelation accompanying it was full, glorious, explicit : the mind of the Lord was to the uttermost made manifest : I was enabled to read it as clearly as though written in characters of fire. It was to the effect,—"*That in the righteous defence of His infallible word I was free—perfectly free : had His sanction to write what I pleased : but that I must write in such spirit and vein as should be glorifying to*

His great name, and thus cut off all occasion from His and my own crafty adversaries."

This grand, this all-glorious vouchsafement, while it utterly broke my bands and relieved from yet lingering anxiety, necessarily entailed upon me an immense amount of extra labour. I had now with all diligence to search through and through the vast mass of matter before me, purging out all that was harsh, grinding, soul-crushing: a work, I need scarcely say, far more difficult, more trying to patience and judgment than the original composition. In conducting this operation, I have found some things by peculiarity of nature altogether too stubborn to be dealt with: treat them as I might, the argument would still wear a severe and withering aspect. To the end therefore that these demonstrations should not appear gratuitously harsh, I have, in deference to the Divine Will, determined to omit all such severer portions of my proof, as with due regard for the defence of Jehovah's truth I conscientiously might. Notwithstanding which sacrifice, it will I trust on examination be seen, that abundant matter for consideration—and that of the very weightiest which can possibly engage the soul of man—yet remains. This, to the end that it may be thoroughly digested, I in the name of God to the intelligent Christian commend: he will find the field to which through necessity I have felt constrained to limit him, ample; nay! if I mistake not, by a degree not inconsiderable, TOO WIDE.

In conclusion it may be well to state, that for the reason already given, and to avoid an unseemly appearance of the love of battle, a considerable portion, perhaps more than half of the Appendix, containing,—Corroborative admissions from papers entitled, "Meditations on the Preceptory Portion of God's Word"—Notes on the gross error of, "Total absence of equitable degrees in the eternal punishment of the wicked"—Remarks on the earlier sentiments and ministerial practice of Mr. Huntington—Notes on a passage from the works of Dr. Owen, lately quoted in the serial called "Gospel Standard"—Analysis and condemnation of a despicable Tract, partly republished by some reckless writer in the above Magazine, and attributed to Dr. Hawker—et cætera—et cætera—has for the present been withheld. Thus hath it come to pass, that in the following pages but half, or it might be less, of the original Manuscript finds place. Much of the matter, however, of that part of the Work now omitted being of high importance, it may at some future period be submitted.

PART FIRST.

THE ARGUMENT AGAINST THE SOVEREIGN COUNSEL OF JEHOVAH BROUGHT INTO JUDGMENT.

CHAPTER I.

THAT ANTISCRIPITURAL TEACHING, WHICH WITH A VIEW TO SUBVERT ONE GRAND PART OF THE SOVEREIGN PURPOSE OF GOD IN THE MINISTRY HAS ON THE EXCLUSIVE WARRANT OF NATURAL REASON BEEN ADVANCED, EXAMINED AND EFFECTUALLY REFUTED.

IN dealing with an error to the exposure of which I have in the course of divine providence been called—an error by which in the Particular or High Calvinistic Baptist Churches the will of God has to a great extent been made void—I have on the one hand to contend with the long-established doctrinal prejudice of tens of thousands; on the other with a very wide-spread, I might even say universal predilection for the illustrious individual, whose teaching, or a part of it, I am under absolute necessity to impugn.

With a view therefore to prevent what under the circumstances may well be anticipated, the outflow of highly natural but in this case altogether inadmissible feeling, I see fit from the very outset to demand, that as a standard by which throughout this inquiry to test the worth of statements, the Word of God alone be recognized. This requirement is so reasonable, so altogether comely and righteous, that no sanctified mind to which the glory of God is dear, will, I apprehend, feel disposed to object to it. With unsanctified souls—souls neither interested to magnify the divine counsels, nor exalt the harmony of revealed truth—but at the expense of that truth set up their own rationalistic deductions—I have no argument. I leave *them* to the dread day of the restitution of all things. I write for those who revere inspired testimony; who believe the Bible to be a record of which every word is true; and which for the instruction and guidance of man has proceeded forth and come from God. To these, the solemn, the most equitable injunction is, that in things divine, things connecting with the momentous matter of salvation, "*they know no man after the flesh*"; but contrariwise, that they let God be true, and every man (it matters not who) that would seek to contravene His word, be a liar. (Rom. iii. 4.)

But ere carrying out the seemingly invidious task in the wisdom of God appointed me, I desire publicly and heartily to testify the high esteem which in respect of learning, but especially Christian

character, I cherish for the very eminent scholar and divine whose teaching, in more respects than one, I shall be under absolute necessity to condemn. Considered not in a dry theological point of view, but a spiritual and experimental, Joseph Charles Philpot must, unquestionably, be admitted to be the greatest writer that has appeared among the churches in which he was felt to be so distinguished an ornament. As an expounder of the mind of the Spirit in the Scriptures, he was amid his brethren unrivalled—standing by a full head and shoulders taller than all his contemporaries. And though evidently with but little experience in the loftier, the sublimer region of the kingdom of grace, yet in a region more ordinary, through continual soul-exercise, very thoroughly, very effectually taught. As a defender of the radical doctrines of salvation, his zeal was unbounded; tinged, it must be admitted, with some harshness. While in walk and conversation as a Christian minister, wisdom as a spiritual counsellor, steadfastness and faithfulness as a personal friend, those who had the advantage of his intimacy are altogether loud in his praise. In a human point of view, therefore, I occupy a position of peculiar difficulty, assume a task of no ordinary responsibility, when thus publicly, in sight of God and man, bringing the teaching of this distinguished servant of Christ into judgment. Hence from the earliest stage of the argument, it is but just on the part of the reader to understand, that with Mr. Philpot as a person, or apart from his position as propounder of the antisciptural errors which I explode, I can have no conceivable cause of quarrel. What in this Treatise I have to do is, to analyze a certain portion of this gifted man's writings, and ascertain whether the instruction therein contained is or is not in accordance with the divine mind; has or has not Jehovah's sanction. That instruction, by the truth of the infallible Word, I shall thoroughly, ay, radically test. All that militates against the wisdom, will, and sovereign right of God, I shall, as a duty to the Lord himself—to the cause of truth—and to the High Calvinistic Baptist Churches—make unmistakably manifest; and contrariwise, whatever from the pen of this distinguished writer I find to be scriptural, and to the use of edifying, *that*, as justly entitled to veneration and praise, it will afford me the liveliest satisfaction to commend.

In pursuance of this design, and without further preamble, I now request the reader to observe, that the particular work of Mr. Philpot from which I intend to quote is, a "Review" by that gentleman of a book entitled, "The Moral Government of God," published many years ago by the Rev. James Wells, late pastor of the Surrey Tabernacle. In that work, Mr. Wells vainly endeavoured to show, that the general exhortations to the masses so

frequent throughout Scripture, but especially in the several fragments extant of apostolic preaching, are with exclusive reference to reformation of life, or external obedience; not in anywise to such acts as accompany salvation; that is, *not (under a free proffer of life) to repentance toward God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ.* And that the whole design of God in these general exhortations is nothing more, than the amelioration of worldly conduct, and mitigation to some extent of future punishment. Such the theory of Mr. Wells; to establish which, as a kind of cover to the practice of not preaching the gospel as by God commanded, was the express object of his book.

But against this hypothesis, the learned Mr. Philpot adduces the substance itself of the general exhortations; and on that stubborn ground effectually overthrows the allegations of Mr. Wells; nay! proves, incontrovertibly, that these general exhortations the intent of which Mr. Wells shows himself so exceedingly anxious to conceal, are exhortations to what have been called "*spiritual acts.*" Thus far then, as with my whole heart I desire to bear him witness, this eminent writer acquits himself as a servant of God—does the cause of truth signal service—and well deserves applause. It is only when leaving that strict deference for divine truth with which he set out, and himself attempting *that* to which he had proved the intellectual acumen of Mr. Wells to be altogether inadequate, viz., justify a practice to which the Bible sternly refuses to afford a shadow of countenance, that he falls into error; nay! abandons himself to statements a thousandfold more gratuitous, than those of the writer whose misinterpretations he so ably refutes; statements, which, if in immediate connexion with the rights of the Divine Majesty considered, are, I deeply regret to be obliged to say, absolutely treasonable.

With a view then to substantiate this charge, I here, verbatim, record the chief of these statements. And I wish it to be distinctly understood, that while in the course of this inquiry I shall have to handle other portions of Mr. Philpot's teaching, as contained in the same "Review" from which the following is extracted, yet this is that special, that particular passage by which, as embodying serious, nay! even criminal error, my attention was, as stated in the introduction, first of all so signally arrested: hence is the passage against which, throughout this entire chapter, it will be my duty to lay down overwhelming demonstration.

THE FALSE TEACHING IMPUGNED.

"But now comes another question; *Are ministers allowed to employ similar exhortations* (that is, to those made use of by the Son of God and his Apostles) *now?* to which if our solution of the diffi-

culty be correct, **THE ANSWER IS EASY.** Do ministers now stand in that position that their words shall ever become part of the sacred volume? or can they feel that they use them under special inspiration? **NO.** If they were to use them, they would do so conscious of their impotency; *and might as well imitate Peter in bidding the lame beggar rise up and walk, AS IMITATE THE APOSTLES IN EXHORTATIONS TO REPENT AND BELIEVE THE GOSPEL.*" (See, Gospel Standard, March, 1841: p. 82.)

Before proceeding to analyze this singularly illogical, this altogether antisciptural and incoherent teaching, it is necessary to call attention to the fact, that that teaching instead of having at the time of its promulgation been brought to the touchstone of Scripture and condemned, was not only *not* thus summarily dealt with, but accepted. Moreover, *has lately as a standard for the ministry from which in future is to be no appeal, been republished*: has with a view to perpetuate that neglect of the divine will to justify which it was at the outset expressly excogitated, once more been disseminated, once more throughout the P. R. Baptist Churches with very general approbation accepted. (See, "Address to the Churches": July, 1872: p. 33.)

Having recorded the particular passage which will in this chapter constitute the subject of inquiry,—having also pointed to its reproduction in proof of the imperative nature of the duty here devolving upon me,—I proceed forthwith to bring it into judgment.

ANALYSIS OF THE TEACHING IMPUGNED.

In making manifest the antisciptural character of this pre-eminently injudicious extract, the first thing necessary is, to set in a clear light ITS DESIGN. That design I emphatically declare to be this, viz., IN THE PUBLIC MINISTRATION OF THE GOSPEL, TO SUBVERT, OR PERPETUALLY OVERTHROW, APOSTOLIC SANCTION AND PRECEDENT. Now granting that such design can be clearly proved against it, then, viewed in any connexion which may be chosen—the Father, the Son, the Holy Spirit, the Word, or the Apostles—this extract of Mr. Philpot must by every sanctified mind be admitted to be, in the highest degree indecorous; must be felt to be *that*, which by virtue of His supremacy, holiness, glory, majesty, Jehovah can by no possibility with the seal of His sanction ratify. I proceed to its analysis.

In tracing the unhallowed design predicated, observe first, that with reference to the ordinance of the public ministry, a plain question is for the purpose of solution proposed, viz., "Are ministers allowed to employ similar exhortations (that is, to those made use of by the apostles) now?" This highly reprehensible question—*question which presumes the existence of power in man to*

set aside at the bidding of reason the example and mandate of his Maker—is that which under some extraordinary misconception of the relation between creature and Creator, Mr. Philpot seems to have thought he had right to propose to the churches. In reality, *the bare freedom to move such a question belongs to no living being.* But if with high hand it should be assumed, then, since the question was one involving issues so unutterably solemn as—*open rejection of the command of God—condemnation of the example and preaching of his Son*—it might possibly be thought, that in order to anything like a positive conclusion, authority the most weighty, warrant the most decisive, would have been deemed indispensable. Such, however, does not appear to have been the idea of Mr. Philpot. If any man doubt, let him examine how this learned gentleman seeks to settle the unlawful question which has by himself thus indecorously been submitted? Is it from any express injunction of the unerring Word? No. From anything implied in any particular portion of the Word? No. From any minute and not generally detected reservations in the practice of the Apostles? No. Not from any of these? from what then? The answer is, FROM THE INGENUITY OF HIS OWN CREATURE BRAIN. Mark the forthcoming of that ingenuity in this second question, wholly foreign to the point at issue, which by way of affording answer to his first, is by the learned gentleman too recklessly proposed: a question so irrelevant—so singularly inconclusive—so altogether unsatisfactory—that to every reflecting mind it must be absolutely inexplicable how so accomplished a scholar should ever have condescended upon it. This second question, the design of which is to extort an answer of the nature required to the first, is, be it observed, moulded in shape so convenient *that the answer to it must infallibly, or of necessity, be NO.* Mr. Philpot asks, “Do ministers now stand in that position in which their words shall ever become a part of the sacred volume? or can they feel that they use them under special inspiration?” Such the very curious, the ill-conceived, the sole ground upon which this distinguished author intends to bring in judgment—*against the imperial mandate of Jehovah—against the example and preaching of his Son.* Upon the strength of this marvellously ill-conceived question, he actually *does* bring in verdict: which verdict, there needs but a single glance at the fashion of his question to make manifest, must of necessity be—NO. Having now, *not by that legitimate standard THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, but by an irrelative quibble so ingeniously contrived that the answer to it must of necessity be NO,* brought in what he conceives to be a sufficient verdict *against ministerial obligation to revere the imperial mandate of Jehovah, against Christian right to defer to the example and preaching of*

his Son, this illustrious gentleman by the greatest master-piece of futile reasoning with which it has ever been my fortune to meet, forthwith proceeds to buttress it. With design to confirm this fallacious verdict—verdict at direct variance with the grand old “BIBLE ONLY” principle of Protestantism—he says, If in the present day ministers *were* to make use of the same exhortations as were used by the Apostles, they might just as well endeavour to give feet (as did Peter) to the lame. Now it is evident, that for any modern minister of the gospel to attempt to give feet to the lame, would be an act of absurdity so great, as to provoke toward the insane perpetrator the gibe of ridicule, and the sneer of scorn. But solemnly asseverates this great but on one point. unhappily prejudiced man, Let a minister only make use in his preaching of truly apostolic exhortation *now*, and instantly, and most deservedly, he renders himself obnoxious to the penalty of such ridicule and scorn. Reduced then to a plain proposition, the reasoning of Mr. Philpot stands thus. To obey God in preaching the gospel to sinners, is in effect to commit folly: and to be guilty of such folly, is most justly to merit ridicule, obloquy, scorn; and *that* to the full as much as he, who arrogating the prerogative of the Creator, insolently determines to work miracles. The consequence is, (*for this is the end or design of the whole*), APOSTOLIC PRACTICE IS TO BE ABJURED.

It may now be seen, that by means of an ill-conceived question, futile reasoning, and gratuitous ridicule, the design of this distinguished writer in the passage before us is, exactly that which in a previous page I have recorded; to wit, *in the grand ordinance of the regeneration—the public ministration of the gospel*—TO SUBVERT OR MAKE UTTERLY VOID DIVINE SANCTION AND PRECEDENT.

Having directed attention to the exceedingly unhappy *design* in the extract under consideration, I deem it next incumbent on me to call in question THE WISDOM, which for some reason, (probably the neglect of the doctrines of grace by other sections of the church), the eminent Mr. Philpot would have us believe pertains to the act of resisting God in this matter of indiscriminate-gospel preaching.

Observe then, that if as this distinguished writer avers, preaching after the example of the Apostles be indeed an act absurd as the unauthorized attempt to give feet to the lame, then, true wisdom necessarily lies *in departing* from apostolic practice, true folly *in adhering* to it. Such the conclusion in which by Mr. Philpot's strange reasoning we are inevitably landed. But is this monstrously irreverent conclusion to stand? Is truth with the learned gentleman, when on pain of ridicule at the hand of himself and brethren he thus seeks to overrule weak minds, and deter from

treading in the footprints of the Apostles? Let us endeavour to ascertain. Be it granted then "that ministers are *not* now in a position to engraft their words upon the Bible, do *not* feel that they can speak under special inspiration," be it all to the uttermost granted. Does common sense a whit the more for that recognize it as wise on the part of such uninspired men to depart from the only safe rule of guidance, the plainly revealed command of Jehovah? Will common sense on the one hand, or the very loftiest genius on the other, ever deign to sanction as wisdom in these persons the setting up on the strength of their own wisdom of a rule for the ministry, at open antagonism with the revealed will of God? It is evident that it will not. For if as Mr. Philpot affirms, ministers in the present day can neither add their words to the Bible nor speak under special inspiration, then, from that fact it is clear, *that Jehovah never designed such parties to be infallible guides to the churches.* However much therefore in the pride of mind any among them might arrogate that distinction, yet in the capacity of infallible guides to Christ's churches, they must remain ABSOLUTELY VALUELESS. Hence in that most momentous of matters, the public ministration of the gospel, ARE ALTOGETHER INCOMPETENT TO DEVISE AND SET UP A RULE. Since then for the very reasons by Mr. Philpot advanced, it is certain that ministers in modern days are altogether incompetent to devise and set up a rule, therefore, so far from its being exalted wisdom, is it not on their part intense folly, yea, presumption, madness, wickedness, *to forsake the clear shining of the light of God in the Word, and defer to the "beggary elements" of earth—THE TREACHEROUS DEDUCTIONS OF SIN-BLINDED REASON?* According to every principle of the Christian faith, this conclusion must necessarily be admitted. For if through the calamity of the fall, men be indeed in that state to which the Scriptures bear witness, *darkened, carrying a vail upon the heart, and by consequence in need of light from on high,* then, had they a mere modicum of that self-distrust which the Scriptures so entirely commend—a solitary ray of self-knowledge by which in spiritual things to apprehend their own utter insufficiency—they might well in the matter of the public ministration of the gospel, as much also in every other spiritual question, *submit to acknowledge the infallible record of inspiration a sufficient lamp for their path, an altogether trustworthy guide for their feet.* Rejecting it, Where I ask in the hearts of such fallen, sin-darkened, personally insufficient creatures that spiritual humility, that self-distrust which ought at all times to characterize them? And again, rejecting it, Whither throughout the wide universe of God should such lofty ministerial rejectors of the divine wisdom turn, in order to *discover for themselves a rule?*

On the strength of the argument here recorded, I am now entitled with all authority to lay it down, that for the very reasons by Mr. Philpot advanced, viz., "because modern ministers shall never be able to add their words to the Bible, and because they shall never be able to speak under special inspiration of God," therefore, not merely is it the truest wisdom, not merely the part of genuine humility, not merely a courtesy at their hand due to the Creator, but the high imperative obligation of all modern ministers of the gospel, gratefully to receive, implicitly to defer to the infallible rule of Scripture: *accounting that practical, that unmistakable manifestation of the Eternal Mind, which through the mandate and practice of the Son of God and his Apostles has there been vouchsafed, to be altogether and to the uttermost decisive.* Failing which, it is the province of every faithful witness of Jehovah, to denounce the spirit and practice of the defaulters a manifest deviation from that humility, that obedience, so steadfastly, so imperatively inculcated in the New Testament.

From this cursory notice of the *design* and *wisdom* peculiar to the pernicious extract under review, I next pass on to notice the grand PRINCIPLE therein involved. That principle, expressed in plain words, is this, viz., *That utter inability to have a hand in framing the sacred volume, combined with equal inability to speak under special inspiration of God, CONFERS RIGHT to set aside the wisdom of the inspired volume, RIGHT to dispute the sovereign mandates of Jehovah, no matter how plainly by the Spirit of truth those mandates may have been revealed.* Strange to say, and altogether impossible to believe, there does through this twofold disability, in some mysterious, some monstrous way—way certainly never destined to be explained nor understood—accrue to ministers of the gospel in general, and to every non-inspired teacher in particular, SPECIAL RIGHT to set aside the determinations of Infinite Wisdom (nobly by the acts of the Son of God and his Apostles exemplified though these be); EQUAL RIGHT to condemn and ridicule those, who as instruments for carrying out Jehovah's will, *do* defer to divine sanction and precedent; ay! and YET FURTHER RIGHT, through this rash condemnation of those who *do* defer to divine sanction and precedent, virtually to condemn the very acts, the infinite wisdom, of the INCARNATE DEITY himself. Reduced to a short, clear proposition, this transcendent principle may in other words be written thus:—*Utter lack in the creature OF INSPIRATION AND AUTHORITY by which to ADD TO THE BIBLE, has of itself virtue TO ARM WITH AUTHORITY AND EMPOWER that creature to BLOT OUT FROM THE BIBLE the imperial mandate of the Creator: nay! hold that imperial mandate itself, and all who revere and obey it, UP TO EVERLASTING CONTEMPT.*

Such the fearful principle involved in the extract under consideration. To the boundless evil of which, I cannot for a moment suppose the eminent individual publishing that extract, to have been *fully* sensible. But since by promulgation of his sentiments *the imaginary right to which I have pointed has been assumed to exist, and its exercise is now fiercely contended for*, the question arises, Are we by tacit acquiescence to admit this principle; and by admitting suffer the extract in which it stands, as an authoritative rule for the ministry from which henceforth is to be no appeal, to be set up? or contrariwise, Is it the duty of every soul that fears God to resist and repudiate it? Let him who through sovereign grace has been separated to the glory of God—him to whose regenerate heart the will and truth of Christ are dear—now give heed to that which for his guidance on this head I have to submit. I affirm, that if the principle in question is to stand, then, here before your eyes—at your very feet—and ready dug to every disobedient hand—yawns open-jawed the grave of Jehovah's whole will, as in the pure precept of the Bible delivered to the Christian Churches. For let the unwarrantable principle here impugned be once admitted, and forthwith the whole body of the inspired precept is abandoned—virtually sacrificed—yielded up to Satan. That this may appear, let us for a single moment in passing, consider the case: let us I say intelligently examine it, and lay hand on its several issues.

Because ministers of the gospel are not *now* able to have a hand in framing the Bible, and because they cannot *now* feel that they speak by express inspiration, therefore, *in the matter of the ministration of the gospel at least, SOVEREIGN RIGHT ACCRUES TO THEM to set aside divine sanction and precedent; equal right, moreover, to condemn and ridicule those who conscientiously revere.* Lofty principle, indeed: therefore let it stand: let it have its perfect work. Not merely because of its matchless wisdom, but, (I speak as a fool), because of the glorious safety which it guarantees to the whole body of the faith once delivered to the saints, let it be universally applied. I very cheerfully accept the task of its universal application: he that hath ears to hear, let him hear. If then, as the pernicious extract impugned would imply, because ministers cannot now help to make a Bible, nor speak by special inspiration of the Spirit, therefore *supreme right* over God's truth has accrued to them; and if it be competent to them, nor competent only, but in one matter at least, *the public ministration of the gospel*, TRANSCENDENTLY WISE TO SET ASIDE THE COMMAND OF JEHOVAH; then, since this very same reasoning, this identical logic does to the fullest extent hold good of *every other scriptural command, even the entire preceptory part of the inspired Word*, it

follows, that it is perfectly lawful, nay, it is even supremely wise in these uninspired men, to set aside THE WHOLE BODY OF THAT DIVINE PRECEPT, which by the Son of God and his Apostles has been delivered to the churches : ay ! to condemn also every humble, obedient soul, that through sanctification of the Spirit would submit to it. A goodly conclusion indeed in which to be landed, by admitting the principle peculiar to that teaching, which at the hand of the distinguished, but in this case too evidently prejudiced Mr. Philpot, has been commended to the High Calvinistic Baptist Churches.

But the matter is more serious still : I may not even with the sacrifice of the whole body of the precept, fix the bound of this disastrous teaching. For the principle which it contains for annihilation of the authority of the precept, is, inconveniently enough for the purpose of the eminent party propounding it, too stubborn to vanish away, when, leaving the precept we turn to the doctrine. Hence in whatever degree that principle may be supposed to avail for the setting aside of *God's righteous precept*, in the very same does it avail for the overthrow of *His saving doctrine*. The entire proposition of the learned gentleman, therefore, when fully developed will stand thus. "Because in modern days ministers of the gospel are not permitted to engraft their words on the Bible, and because they cannot feel that they speak by special or divine inspiration, therefore, first, *as far as the public ministration of the gospel is concerned*, supreme right has accrued to them, or in other words, it has altogether become lawful to them, at their creature will and pleasure to set aside the gospel mandate of Jehovah—no matter how plainly by the Holy Ghost that mandate may have been revealed. And secondly, Because the same parties are not now permitted to engraft their words upon the Bible, nor to speak by special or divine inspiration, therefore, *as far as all other preceptorial commands are concerned*, supreme right has accrued to them, or in other words, it has altogether become lawful to them, at their creature will and pleasure to set aside those righteous behests of God—no matter how plainly by the Holy Spirit such behests may have been revealed. And thirdly, Because the very same parties are not now permitted to add their words to the Bible, nor to speak under special or divine inspiration, therefore, *as far as all the sublime and salvatory doctrines of the Bible are concerned*, supreme right has accrued to them, or in other words, it has altogether become lawful to them, at their creature will and pleasure to set at naught those saving truths of Jehovah—no matter how plainly by the Holy Ghost such truths may have been revealed. Compressed into one short, pithy sentence, the antisciptural principle under review shows thus :

Because in modern days men cannot add to the perfected record of the Bible, nor by inspiration of the Spirit prophecy, therefore, to each individual in particular ARISES ABSOLUTE RIGHT TO DENOUNCE, TO BAN, AND TO TRAMPLE, any or every portion of Jehovah's word and will, which through prejudice, or the deductions of natural reason, HE may not approve. Excellent principle ! only let it stand, and the doctrines are no whit more secure than the whole body of the precept ; the whole body of the precept no safer than *that particular precept*, "GO YE INTO ALL THE WORLD AND PREACH THE GOSPEL TO EVERY CREATURE." Nay ! I am bold to say, that of these three, the doctrines of grace perhaps stand in the most imminent jeopardy. For the same principle which upon the loose Antinomian confers full right to cast away all that to his carnal nature is displeasing of the precept, does upon the hostile spirit of the Arminian, that also of the Pelagian and infidel, confer equal right to trample underfoot the doctrine of divine sovereignty, of election, and of infallible grace. For this fearful principle, to wit, THAT LACK OF INSPIRATION IN THE CREATURE, CONFERS RIGHT TO TRAMPLE THE TRUTH AND WILL OF THE CREATOR, once established, does as effectually throw wide the door of licence to this uninspired party as to that. Thus once more the old proverb, "*Extremes meet*," is seen to be literally fulfilled : for while in fleshly-wise determination to hedge and fence the unspeakably glorious doctrines of grace, the illustrious Mr. Philpot makes strong as he deems his line of battle, he at unawares indeed yet most effectually, provides both sanction and a free field for the ravage of every invader.

But here, doubtless, some tender consciences begin to start, begin to recoil before this wholesale sacrifice of all that is glorious and saving in the Word. Methinks I hear it urged, "God forbid that we should proceed thus far : that would indeed be to surrender all that to the Christian heart is precious, life-giving, sanctifying : it is necessary to draw the bound short of so extreme a point as that." But I reply, Nay ; for if the principle by Mr. Philpot advocated be worth anything, it is surely worth *respecting* : once established, therefore, it may *not* be arbitrarily set aside. Either it is good, or it is altogether and detestably bad. If good, it has a right to apply not merely to the *public ministration of the gospel*, but to all else that lawfully falls within its embrace. If competent to set aside divine teaching and sanction in one instance, then, most assuredly competent to set aside that teaching and sanction in all. So much for it, supposing it to be good. But if its soundness be rejected—if at length it be discovered to be fallacious, disastrous, dangerous—then, the regret remains that it should ever have been propounded ; should ever as a sound and

trustworthy principle, have been palmed and re-palmed upon tens of thousands of unreflecting natures in the P. R. Baptist Churches?

Thus much for the pernicious *principle* involved in the teaching which I condemn. And now that with all clearness its true nature has been made manifest, no man with a reasonable claim to possession of tenderness of conscience, no man professing to cherish the fear of God in his heart, would for a single moment I conclude be willing to contend for it. But to proceed.

Leaving further reference to *the principle* I next approach a matter which by its very nature must, in every case where the heart is tender toward the divine honour, touch it *to the very core*. I allude to the extremely unhappy manner in which, *by denying the revealed rule for ministerial guidance*, the extract under examination REFLECTS ON the fatherly wisdom, goodness, care, foresight, faithfulness, love, of the ever adorable Jehovah. Here, again, it would almost appear certain, that the erudite framer of this objectionable teaching was not himself entirely sensible, that embosomed in his own sophistry lay that reprehensible impeachment of the divine honour, to which in very faithfulness I point. But thus much by way of extenuation being now most freely granted, it only the more effectually serves to show the imperative need, that by general abandonment throughout the Churches of a teaching to the divine glory thus prejudicial, Jehovah should, as to his fatherly faithfulness, be henceforth and for ever magnified.

But to the proof: for it is written, "In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established." I proceed therefore to summon the witnesses. "Behold I am a *father unto Israel*, saith the Lord." (Jer. xxxi. 9.) Here then is the first. "We have also a *more sure word of prophecy*; whereunto ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a *light that shineth in a dark place*, until the day dawn, and the day-star arise in your heart: knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man: but *holy men of God spake AS THEY WERE MOVED BY THE HOLY GHOST*:" (2 Pet. i. 19—21): and again, "*All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and IS profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be perfect, THOROUGHLY FURNISHED UNTO ALL GOOD WORKS.*" (2 Tim. iii. 18, 19.) Here is witness the second. "*To the law and the testimony*: if they speak not ACCORDING TO THIS WORD, it is because there is no light in them." (Is. viii. 20.) Here, finally, is witness the third.

According then to the first of these witnesses, and the witness is divine, *God expressly claims to be A FATHER to his people*. Of a father it is required, nay! it is his glory, that he be faithful to

the best interests of his children. But with regard to the interests of God's regenerate yet fallen family, it may very safely be laid down, that they cannot be adequately provided for except through correct guidance: for such interests are not carnal and temporal, but *spiritual and eternal*. Now God by that fatherly relation to His people, in which before His angels He has seen fit to glory, has made it to appear, *that He is bound to lead, teach, and guide that people in the way of truth and righteousness*. So much for witness the first. And according to the second, it is proved, that the infallible Scripture is that true light, which for the guidance of His children amid the moral and spiritual darkness consequent on sin, the Lord in very faithfulness to the fatherly relation claimed, has seen fit to vouchsafe. And this Holy Scripture it is declared is profitable, not merely for guidance in one matter, nor in sundry, but in all; even to the least important in which the child of God can ever while a wanderer in this wilderness of earth be concerned. By the light of the Word therefore, by its infallible dicta, and the examples in its pages so vividly set before The Church, God has nobly vindicated His claim to fatherly character; having with the utmost faithfulness done all that in an instrumental point of view was necessary—to *perfect the wisdom—instruct the understanding—and effectually fence from error—the soul of every regenerate child of God*: and *this*, it is written, with express design that the man of God MIGHT BE PERFECT, THOROUGHLY FURNISHED UNTO EVERY GOOD (IT IS NOT SAID FALSE) WORK. So much for witness the second. And according to the third, it is expressly stated, that at all times, and in every difficulty, appeal is to be made to the ever-glorious Word; that Word, which for the express purpose of guarding the children from delusion, and guiding in the path of honour, has at the fatherly hand of God been revealed. For that Word is not an instrument unto error, but a sure word of prophecy; a light sent from the eternal throne, to illumine the souls of God's children. Hence if any man, great or small, no matter who, presume to speak contrary to it, Jehovah shall bear witness against that person as one, who, *at least in those particular points on which he has presumed to differ*, "HAS NO HOLY LIGHT IN HIM." That is, his walk and conversation in this respect are not scriptural, not obedient, not acceptable, not for the glory of God, not thankworthy, not spiritually loving, not filial, not in a Christian sense honourable; but contrariwise, self-reliant, foolish, headstrong, high-minded, unworthy, reprehensible. So much for witness the third. Surely then with all justice I may maintain, that between witnesses such as these, we have evidence in abundance to clear Jehovah of the charge of neglect in providing faithful guidance: guidance as I

have said, not merely in one point, nor even in sundry, but IN ALL. On this head, therefore, there needs no further proof.

But what, I ask, is both implied and maintained in that most unworthy extract against which I protest? Set forth in plain words, is it not this, That God *has* failed to give His people—but especially His accredited ministers in modern days—any real instruction as to His sovereign will in the public ministration of the gospel? *has* left them (at least as far as *that* momentous matter is concerned) altogether without guidance? For if, as by Mr. Philpot affirmed, because modern ministers cannot *now* add their words to the Bible, and because they cannot *now* speak under special inspiration of the Spirit, therefore the mandate and practice of the Son of God and his Apostles are as a rule of guidance made altogether worthless, then, since that which once seemed to be divine authority for ministerial practice, is at length by the penetration of this learned gentleman proved to be no authority, where for the right execution of their awfully important office is there to the true servants of God vouchsafed any divine, any infallible rule? Extinguished by the fact of the non-inspiration of modern ministers, the authority which properly belongs to the teaching of the Son of God and His Apostles, and though you search the wide universe itself for a rule of guidance, it is evident you must fail to find. In which case I aver, the children of the covenant, but especially its accredited ministers, are in this grand matter left utterly uncared for—left to any and every imagination which through natural ignorance may spring in their hearts. Behold here, by a single stroke of Mr. Philpot's pen, the entire testimony of the three foregoing witnesses annihilated. But on behalf of whose glory have we the testimony of those witnesses? Is it not the glory of *God*? Is it not to vindicate His faithfulness to that fatherly relation, which by virtue of the righteousness and blood of His Son He has seen fit to assume toward Israel? It is admitted. Yet here have we them all cut down at a stroke: that stroke, mark, being administered by the hand of one, *himself also a non-inspired mortal*. Might not the very angels weep? For by this act, are not mere creature testimonies, but the infallible testimonies of inspiration itself, all substantially sacrificed; while the fatherly excellences of the Godhead, to wit, the wisdom, goodness, care, foresight, faithfulness, love, which like flowers of fragrance those infallible testimonies were designed to guard, are all given over to contempt.

But to argue this point at yet greater length. If the accredited ministers of the Cross cannot now add their words to the Bible, nor speak under special inspiration, then, as in an earlier page of this Treatise I have shown, it is evident that Jehovah never in-

tended to make them infallible guides to the Church of Christ. And if so, it will certainly on all hands be admitted, that the great Inspirer of the Apostles, the Eternal Spirit, would necessarily have been as clear, as thoroughly conversant with that fact as His non-inspired servant, the learned gentleman with whom I differ. Knowing therefore that to the exclusion of all others, the Apostles alone were to be the instruments of Jehovah in framing the New Testament,—knowing also that for the instruction of the Church in the divine will throughout all ages, a trustworthy (not delusive) record was absolutely essential,—knowing moreover that for the carrying out of purposes grand as those suspended upon the Cross of Christ, the written word was to be the only instrument publicly recognized as infallible,—over and above which, knowing certainly, that as the divine Inspirer of those recording the word His own honour must necessarily and eternally be bound up with that word,—it doubtless behoved the Holy Spirit to deal very carefully. Reasons weighty and momentous as the above, should at least have been deemed sufficient to prevent His setting forth a *false record*, a deceptive and vain rule by which to betray the children of God to error. Since by every ingenuous, every rightly judging party, this must necessarily be admitted, it concerns me for the eliciting of truth to ask, Was the inspirer of the Apostles, the Holy Ghost, so utterly reckless of the well-being of *that* which with the heart's blood of Immanuel had been purchased, as to suffer, nay! cause, that Apostles by Himself inspired, should in the great name of Jehovah set before the redeemed Church both commandment and example which, supposing the extract under inquiry to be worth aught, ARE BUT A SNARE AND TRAP? commandment and example, which all non-inspired ministers that should ever follow after the inspired writers, should in their public ministration of the gospel HAVE FREE RIGHT TO REJECT? right also, where adopted in the public ministration of others, PUBLICLY TO CENSURE AND CONDEMN? Is this, I ask, to be imputed to the Spirit of God? Does this indeed accurately represent His unspeakable solicitude for the honour, the well-being of the Bride,—her who through an eternally predestined affinity with the heart of Christ, is to Jehovah as the very apple of His eye? Were this indeed true, as through venturing to deviate from the Holy Scriptures Mr. Philpot has substantially represented, how portentous, how ineradicable the blot, which it would bring upon the wisdom, truth, love, and faithfulness, of the all-gracious, the immaculate Jehovah. Under such circumstances, what must of necessity have been thought, not merely by the entire nest of the hostile spirits in hell, but by the pure celestial intelligences in light, of a wisdom which could ordain, a Spirit

which could inspire Apostles, to set forth instruction which notwithstanding its being by the awful name of God guaranteed,—notwithstanding as a reliable record thrust into the very bosom of the Church,—is yet so palpably erroneous, *that every non-inspired minister to the end of time is justified* IN OPENLY DEPARTING FROM IT; nay! is absolutely worthy of honour, distinction, crowning, *in proportion to the severity, the bitterness, with which he heaps upon it* HIS CREATURE CONTEMPT? And by contrast with this want of wisdom and affection on the part of the Holy Spirit, how dazzlingly bright before heaven, the earth, and hell would the wisdom and faithfulness of that non-inspired minister of the gospel blaze forth, who in this nineteenth century of the Christian era, and sixth millennium of the world's existence, could arise—intuitively lay finger upon the Holy Spirit's error—as a snare and trap hold it up for a warning to all Christians—forbid that in the ministry it should be followed—ay, and before the archangels above, the Churches of Christ beneath, *with well-merited reproach, ridicule, scorn, consign to everlasting oblivion.*

Were such things indeed true, as through too credulously lending ear, to the rationalistic deductions of men a multitude in the P. R. Baptist Churches have suffered themselves to believe, I candidly confess, that I see not how Jehovah whose portion is the exalted glory of His own being, could either to Himself, or His lofty archangels, venture to vindicate the divine integrity.

But if upon the wisdom of the Spirit blot so portentous can by no conceivable possibility alight, then, it touches the love of every regenerate member of the mystical body of Christ, every mortal man in the sight of whom the wisdom and glory of God are sacred, every soul that would see that wisdom and glory vindicated, to take whatever means are lawful, whatever possible, to cause that the infallible word of the Living God *be respected*: the antagonistic opinions by which non-inspired parties would assay to supersede them, *excluded*. To his own master must every man at last stand or fall: each and all are here summoned to a sacred duty. In that solemn duty, I myself set the example: on Jehovah's infallible word, which is light, I take my immovable stand: and every opinion of man which would militate against **THAT WORD**, I publicly and absolutely condemn.

The next thing which in the course of this inquiry falls to me to handle is, that RIDICULE which in the antiscriptural extract under examination is cast upon the righteous act of deferring to divine sanction and precedent. If, says the excellent Mr. Philpot, any modern minister of Christ *should* in his preaching make use of the same exhortations as were by the Master and His Apostles incessantly adopted, he might just as well openly stultify himself

by seeking to follow Peter in the working of miracles. Being under imperative obligation to dispute it, I once more take upon me the responsibility of that proof by which it is to be brought to nought.

Mark then, first, the ground by this Rev. gentleman specially chosen, on which to establish the act of deferring to the divine will, supremely, sublimely ridiculous. He says, "If they (ministers) were in their public ministrations to make use of the same exhortations as were used by the Son of God and His Apostles, they must do so *conscious of their (the exhortations') impotency.*" This consciousness on the part of ministers, that the mere exhortation, or exhortation without the Spirit's power, IS IMPOTENT TO SAVE, is, according to Mr. Philpot's judgment, quite sufficient to stamp the act of following the Son of God and His Apostles altogether and inexpressibly ridiculous. Let the reader be pleased to keep this in view.

The attempt here made to stultify those who defer to divine sanction and precedent, necessarily involves one of the two following things. Either that the Apostles, along with those general exhortations of which in their public ministration of the gospel they made such frequent use, had power to infuse regenerating grace into the heart and by this means at their pleasure convert ; or, if they had not that power, then, that they also by the daily use of general exhortation in their preaching, rendered themselves ridiculous as the men at whom Mr. Philpot so causelessly sneers. Because, if they had *not* power along with the exhortation to infuse grace into the heart and convert, then, they themselves were as conscious of the impotency of the mere exhortation as any modern minister of the gospel can possibly be. To one or the other of these SUPPOSITIONS, we are by the extract under consideration absolutely shut up. The question therefore remains, Is either proposition true ? or are both altogether and utterly false ?

Let us examine the first. Be it asked, Did the Apostles when delivering those general exhortations with which their public discourses are replete, stand possessed of power to infuse regenerating grace into the heart, or did they not ? It is evident that if the apostles *had* stood possessed of so extraordinary a power, then, in order to wield that power aright, they must also have had infallible knowledge of every individual in the crowd whose soul in the secret counsels of eternity had by God been predestinated to life ; for without such infallible knowledge, their power must have proved a most dangerous weapon against the divine purposes. If it be asked, Why ? Because, absolutely ridiculous though the idea be it is yet a fact, that without this knowledge,

they would continually have been regenerating the wrong party ; and since it is written, that "*the gifts and calling of God are*" (*on His part*) "*without repentance,*" the blunder by His accredited agents thus perpetrated, could not have been rectified. Thus the eternally premeditated purposes of Jehovah would irremediably have been marred. Since then in order to a right wielding of the magnificent power of regeneration, knowledge of every elect soul in the crowd was beyond controversy indispensable, I put the question, Did these apostles when carrying out the work of public preaching, absolutely know every elect vessel to whom (for his or her effectual conversion) it was their duty along with the general exhortation preached to impart regenerating grace ? Such the problem : for its solution there is nothing left us save ingenuous appeal to the Scriptures. Do the Scriptures then at all testify to this gift in the apostles ? or, do those inspired men themselves at any time appear to arrogate it ? *They do not.* Again, Do the actual facts which in connection with apostolic preaching have been recorded, in anywise lead us to suppose that the apostles possessed such a gift ? or, Is there in any place implied or stated a shadow of evidence from which even dubiously to infer it ? *Nay, verily.* What then ? Contrariwise, everything to prove, that while for the framing of the infallible Scripture the apostles were by the Spirit of God abundantly qualified, and wrote by authority, *yet as preachers of the gospel they occupied the very same ground as others ; knew as little of the real, the eternal result of their labours, as any non-inspired minister of the present day.* If not thus ignorant, Why, I submit, were Ananias and Sapphira admitted into the Church ? Why the worldly-minded Demas ? Why Hymeneus and Philetus ? Why Simon Magus, the woman Jezebel, and many others whose carnality and hypocrisy the inspired penmen themselves have rendered famous ? Had the apostles indeed infallible foreknowledge concerning these ? I pause for a reply. Not a reply, random and reckless, but sound, trustworthy, scriptural. If it be pleaded, that they certainly *did* know them, but *not* as the elect of God : Why then, I demand, were they by the apostles themselves admitted into the Church ? But if to escape this difficulty it be said, that these parties *were* the elect of the Father, and in that character the apostles verily *did* know them, hence received them into the Church : might it not most righteously be replied, Since these inspired men knew them to be souls elect and precious, and since in addition to the word of exhortation they themselves stood entrusted with the power to impart regenerating grace and effectually convert, why did they not execute their divine mission more effectually—more faithfully—more for the glorification of the divine grace—more like sensible men—in a single

word, more like accredited Apostles of the Lamb? But were further evidence necessary, then, in so many plain words the Scripture itself gives us to understand, that in the economy of grace not only is the act of regenerating souls exclusively reserved to the Spirit, but that the high prerogative to dispense the Holy Spirit's grace, is by virtue of the sacrifice of the cross the right of the Son of God alone. Mark it:—"For as the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; *even so* THE SON *quickeneth whom HE WILL.*" And again,— "*Verily, verily, I say unto you, the hour is coming, and NOW IS, when the dead shall hear the voice of the SON OF GOD: and they that hear SHALL LIVE.*" (Jo. v. 21, 25.)

I assume that I have now effectually disposed of the first of the two SUPPOSITIONS, to which by the antiscriptural extract under review we are absolutely shut up. Commending therefore to the intelligence of the reader the evidence which has been advanced, I proceed forthwith to deal with *the second.*

With regard to the second, the case is self-evident, and needs no proof. For if once upon the evidence adduced it be granted, that the Apostles did *not* stand possessed of power to apply the grace of regeneration—held *not* divine commission at their will and pleasure to convert—then, as far as the public ministration of the gospel is concerned, these divinely commissioned men occupied the very same ground as other evangelical preachers; that is, made use of the general exhortations with which their recorded discourses absolutely abound, UNDER A CONSCIOUSNESS OF THE IMPOTENCY OF THE MERE EXHORTATION TO THE FULL AS GREAT, *as that which is peculiar to any modern minister of Christ.* It inevitably follows, that each and all of these inspired men were chargeable with the insane act OF RENDERING THEMSELVES SUPREME AND EVERLASTINGLY RIDICULOUS; yea! as ridiculous as the man, who, in the absence of express authority from above, actually makes the abortive attempt to work miracles. If then the use of general exhortations to the unconverted by a modern and non-inspired preacher, he held to be ridiculous on the ground that he uses such exhortations *conscious of the fact that the exhortation standing alone is impotent*, then, by the very same rule, the use of such general exhortations by an Apostle *under equal consciousness that the exhortation standing alone is impotent*, must be held to be an act equally absurd and ridiculous. If a laughing-stock and a hissing in the one case, as certainly a laughing-stock and a hissing in the other.

Now what have we at length arrived at? Something, I affirm, dreadfully offensive in the sight of God, and equally repugnant to the moral and spiritual sense of every regenerate creature; to wit, a mortal man with no more stable authority than the deductions

of his own reason, calling down not merely upon the sanction and precedent but the very persons of the Apostles of God, *ridicule and scorn*: a soul through the free favour of Jehovah redeemed by blood, unwittingly it may be but very effectually *exciting contempt in the bosom of the Church*, for that wisdom by gift of which the Holy Spirit perfected for their high office, and distinguished as the accredited agents of God, the twelve Apostles. Nor these alone, but the noble Paul also, the soul-devoted Apostle of the Gentiles.

At this point, I seem to see every Christian endowed with tender conscience grow pale—cry out aghast—‘Mr. Philpot never could have intended that.’ To which I reply, if it be meant that with full knowledge of the result he coldly and calculatingly intended the Holy Ghost this insult, I most freely concede that he did *not*. But by a too implicit reliance on rational deduction, and an altogether inexcusable departure from the authority of revealed truth, the terrible consequence is exactly that which I have affirmed. For the fact is indisputable, that if this learned gentleman’s allegations be argued to their logical, their legitimate conclusion, the issue to which I have pointed is inevitable.

I have now singled out the leading points which in this most indefensible extract have seemed to me to demand exposure. A few of minor importance remain, and require also to be handled; that the full magnitude of its injustice, the length and breadth of its offending, may be made manifest.

The first of these minor points is, the highly objectionable way in which, passing by candour and equity, *Mr. Philpot* IGNORES THE PALPABLE DIFFERENCE between the humble, the filial act of submitting to the plainly expressed will of God, and the proud presumptuous act, of determining in right’s despite to usurp divine prerogative; this highly cultivated, greatly intelligent, habitually thoughtful and discriminating man, affecting to discern in both the very same spirit and motive; hence without distinction or difference, condemning both as equally reprehensible. Now such by this illustrious writer being the chosen method of dealing, the question naturally suggests itself, Where was Mr. Philpot’s universally admitted intelligence, his more than average measure of ability, when he thus unhappily suffered himself to confound together, a simple act of Christian obedience to divine command, and the presumption of attempting unauthorised to work miracles? A word on this head must certainly be in season—seems to me absolutely imperative: let me not therefore to the prejudice of the cause which I espouse, seem unrighteously to withhold it.

With a view to clearness, be it asked, When any earnest, gracious, devoted Christian minister, say, Owen, Bunyan, Flavel, Beridge, Whitfield, Newton, deferring to the divine will as in the

example of the Son of God and His Apostles nobly illustrated, makes use in his ministry of the same exhortations to the unconverted as did they, is it indeed a fact, that such an one either arrogates to himself *the power of converting souls*? or as a consequence of his preaching *certainly assumes their conversion*? He does NOT. He simply preaches the gospel to men in that way in which his exemplars, the Lord Jesus Christ, and all His inspired Apostles preached it: he leaves results with God. But if he does *not* arrogate power to convert souls, nor as an infallible result of his preaching *assume* the certainty of their conversion, but leaves all results with God—leaves Jehovah by His own chosen means to work out His own sovereign ends—then, in what respect, let it be shown, is such act similar to the insane act of attempting unauthorized to give feet to the lame? To make these acts similar, it is evident, that in both must reside *the same impertinent pretension to power*: and without that pretension, no mental ingenuity, no jesuitical cunning, nay! not the heart-malignity of Satan himself may avail to prove the two acts similar. At the hand therefore of every one who in this particular respect approves the teaching under examination, I require it to be shown, Where in connexion with an act of humble Christian obedience—an act by express mandate of Jehovah rendered imperative—an act for immediate instigation to which is set forth the example of the Son of God and all His inspired Apostles—an act moreover in which no power is arrogated by the instrument, but all results involving power left with God—this highly accomplished gentleman finds ground upon which to pronounce the actor erroneous? his act precisely similar in character to that of the man, who destitute of divine authority presumptuously insists on working miracles? But if any just ground for this assertion cannot be found, then, it is clear, that all such asserting is as far removed from Christian equity, as the practice which it was intended to defend is from righteousness and the sanction of Jehovah. Be it therefore once for all laid down—written as with lead in the rock for ever—that the servant of Christ who preaches the gospel upon the very pattern of the preaching of the Divine Master, upon that also of all His inspired Apostles, is not as the antisciptural teaching under review would imply, justly chargeable with error, madness, ignorance, miscalculation; nay! nor with deviation by the breadth of a hair from the very loftiest standard of spiritual wisdom. Would the rashly judging mortal whose verdict I explode, presume in the presence of God thus to charge all the most honoured that have ever lived of Christ's servants? or would he rather, as far at least as *that particular part of Jehovah's will is concerned—the preaching of Christ to sinners*—be in his own despite constrained to acknow-

ledge, "THEY HAVE BEEN INFINITELY MORE RIGHTEOUS THAN I?" These men can stand in the full blaze of the eternal throne, and point for their mission to the Word; for the mode of its execution to the example of the Son of God, and all His inspired Apostles. In the face of warrant, of exemplars such as these, who at the judgment-seat of Christ shall dare to denounce their obedience error? their humble devotion folly? To do so, must infallibly have for its effect, to condemn Him who sits upon the throne,—the eternal Father who sent Him,—and the glorified Twelve who stand around. To whom, I ask, pertains the hardihood that dare venture THAT? But change now the contemplation. Imagine for a moment that some servant of Christ should be rash enough, *without* express authority, *without* endowment with supernatural gift, *without* divine and special call, to stand forth in public and arrogating divine prerogative insist upon giving feet to the lame: *that*, unquestionably, would be presumption—*that*, in the highest degree reprehensible—that, the very act of a madman, a fool, or a villain. I ask then the party, in this case most of all prejudiced, Was Mr. Philpot so dark, so incompetent as not to know this? Could he possibly have failed to know? Are these two acts of a verity so similar? or, are they altogether different and distinct? If distinct, then, I further demand, Is the line of demarkation between them dim—exceedingly difficult to be discerned? or, is it altogether clear and unmistakable—so that even the mind of a child may apprehend it? If thus clear, thus absolutely unmistakable, then, Was the talented, the deeply-thinking, the erudite and accomplished writer before us so *poor* a hand at judging questions, so *little* versed in the art of discriminating, as not to be able to discern the difference between things thus radically differing? Who shall venture to affirm it? Why then I submit on the part of one naturally, intellectually, educationally, so far above average, *this deliberate ignoring of the beauty of filial obedience? this wilful confounding of a gracious and loving Christian act with the insolence, nay! the madness of pretending to the power of Jehovah?*

The next matter of minor importance calling for notice is, the marvellous ease with which in March 1841 Mr. Philpot SETTLES THAT QUESTION, which in February of the same year or but one short month previously, he had admitted to be fraught with stupendous, nay! *insuperable* difficulty. In the month of February, speaking with intellectual humility concerning the great perplexity in which through the general exhortations of Scripture tender consciences become involved, the learned gentleman says, "ANY HELP, then, in this deeply important matter, any sound and scriptural contribution to REMOVE THESE DIFFICULTIES, any real approach to disentangle THIS PERPLEXING QUESTION we desire to

receive thankfully." (p. 53.) In this passage there is not merely *general* acknowledgment of the difficulty in connection with apostolic exhortation, as felt by the P. R. Baptist Churches at large, but *particular* admission of the hardness, ay, the utter impossibility of arriving at any satisfactory conclusion, as experienced by the mind of the learned gentleman himself. Yet strange to say, only one short month subsequently, we find this very eminent man for all practical purposes within the pale of the P. R. Baptist Churches settling, and that by a single stroke of his uninspired pen, *the very point which so lately he had acknowledged to be involved in impenetrable mystery.* Settling it, mark, not upon the solid basis of Scripture, but by a hastily evolved, an altogether irrelevant quibble of his own brain. This fact, is so exceedingly curious, so singularly strange and significant, as to be worth a moment's consideration. What then be it asked, as clearly traceable upon the face of his pages, the root of inconsistency thus remarkable on the part of one—as a Christian so spiritually enlightened—as a writer so eminently gifted?

Any candid inquirer who shall be at the pains of examining the first part of the "Review" from which I quote, as in February 1841 published by Mr. Philpot, will at a glance perceive, that in that paper this distinguished man was dealing with a theory, professedly a solution of Particular Redemption Baptist difficulty, which had been advanced by *Mr. James Wells.* But the same inquirer on turning to the concluding portion of the "Review," as published in the following March, will find, that the learned gentleman *was HIMSELF propounding a solution of the very same difficulty.* This, and this alone, be it noted, is the root of the remarkable difference discernible between Mr. Philpot's estimate of that difficulty which in February he had acknowledged to be insuperable, and his estimate of it a single month later, viz., in March of the same year. When it is the theory of Mr. James Wells that is to be exploded, then, the difficulty in question is great; the whole length and breadth of its bulk are made to appear. But when a single month later it is the learned gentleman himself who propounds the solution, then, as if by magic the case assumes an entirely different aspect. *The difficulty now proves to be trifling, the whole case susceptible of settlement* AT A SINGLE STROKE OF THE TALENTED GENTLEMAN'S PEN.

The evidence in proof of this singular inconsistency, is found in that magically evolved but highly unsatisfactory *verdict against the right of ministers to obey God,* which, having by the ill-conceived query to which I have pointed obtained, Mr. Philpot hesitates not as a solution of their difficulty to commend to the P. R. Baptist Churches. This *summarily evoked verdict,* even more than the

learned writer's own words which openly assert the wondrously easy character of his labours, is altogether conclusive as to the absoluteness of his estimate with respect to that easiness. Let the magical facility with which this *verdict* is brought forth be carefully noted. "Are ministers," confidently asks this gifted man, "allowed to employ similar exhortations (to those used by the apostles) *now* ? to which if our solution of the difficulty be correct, THE ANSWER IS EASY. Do ministers now stand in that position, that their words shall ever become part of the sacred volume ? or can they feel that they use them under special inspiration ? NO !" Now, observe, here is the problem stated, and with an instantaneousness altogether unprecedented solved. For we here have, as I shall presently prove, *not* a mere submitting of the case ; not the mere tender of a suggestion—an idea—a thought ; no ; but for the settlement of that identical difficulty, which in the month of February had on behalf of the whole body of the P. R. Baptist Churches and learned gentleman himself been acknowledged to be absolutely baffling, A MAGISTERIAL DECREE : a decree embodying explicit denial of the right of ministers to obey God, and that, *brought in without the intervention of soul-exercise—without prayerful anxiety—without aid of anything so troublesome or inconvenient as protracted scriptural meditation—brought in EASILY*. Here then in sheer contempt of difficulty—difficulty the most baffling and insuperable—is the question for all practical purposes within the pale of the P. R. Baptist Churches, with the rapidity of a lightning-flash set at rest.

But perhaps it may be pleaded, Is there not some slight reservation to be detected in the passage,—is it not said, "*if* our solution of the difficulty be correct ?" That it is so said, I admit : and yet as I shall very effectually prove, the plea sought to be set up on that ground must certainly and entirely fail. And why ? Because, not merely according to my reading of this pernicious extract, but according to that of tens of thousands besides, the fact is made startlingly manifest, that the slight palliative under consideration *was never by the illustrious author intended TO DESTROY, nor in the minds of his readers has had for its effect EVEN TO WEAKEN, the determined character of that judgment which the whole passage was intended to convey*. From the evidence which in demonstration of this point I shall now adduce, it will by every ingenuous inquirer be admitted, that the fact to which I have referred him, to wit, *that the slight palliative in question HAS NO POWER WHATSOEVER upon the positive nature of Mr. Philpot's intent*, is absolutely indisputable.

Let the reader of his courtesy observe,—That the original "Review" from which the teaching under examination is ex-

tracted, I here hold in my right hand. I cast my eye upon the date of its publication, and find it to be March 1841. Mark then what follows. Antiscriptural, illogical, nay ! positively absurd as was the teaching which that "Review" contained—presumptuous and evil in the sight of God as were its spirit and design—gratuitous and unhallowed as was the ridicule by which it was propped and buttressed—derogatory to the scholarship and ministerial dignity of the distinguished person from whom emanating as on all sides it must now be admitted to be—yet in the year named was this most treasonable document by every member of the P. R. Baptist Churches—office-bearers, lay preachers, and ministers included—suffered to pass unchallenged. Not a voice out of fifty thousand was in the name of God lifted up against it ; nay, nor a single pen dipped in the ink of truth and equity to bring against it the Lord's righteous condemnation. And not only so : for to the present day, a period of three and thirty years, has the substance of this reprehensible record undisputed been suffered to stand. No faithful testimony from the Churches *in general*, no righteous refutation at the hand of any individual *in particular*, having in the name of God gone forth against it. Call now to mind, the daring nature of the decree, the unhallowed character of the judgment delivered, to wit, *That it is NOT LAWFUL in the public ministration of the gospel for a modern minister to submit to the imperial mandate of Jehovah ; is NOT LAWFUL to defer to the personal example of His Son and all the inspired Apostles ; but in place of its being lawful is* ERRONEOUS, DEBASING, ABSURD : call I say this fearful statement to mind, and when the greatness of the indignity, the full magnitude of the offence here offered to the Almighty has been duly apprehended, then, let it be shown, how it has come to pass that the entire body of the P. R. Baptist Churches—their office-bearers, ministers, and lay preachers inclusive—have for a period so exceedingly protracted permitted teaching thus irreverent, thus unscriptural, thus unjustifiable, to go unchallenged ? Clearly, as I have affirmed, because that teaching, unholy and irreverent though it unquestionably is, was nevertheless on the exclusive authority of its illustrious propounder *accepted* : nor accepted only, *but as an* ABLE JUDGMENT—A JUDGMENT *for all practical purposes within the pale of the Calvinistic Baptist Churches disposing of an unwelcome question for ever—admired and exalted.*

But not only, as has been shown, was the false teaching against which in the name of God I protest unquestioningly received by the P. R. Baptist Churches in 1841, and by general consent up to the year of grace 1872 tacitly sanctioned, but, for the very same purpose for which in 1841 it had by its illustrious author been propounded, viz., *to subvert in the public ministration of the gospel divine sanction and precedent*, was in the year of grace 1872

ONCE MORE within their pale rashly printed ; ONCE MORE perseveringly disseminated ; nay ! was—as an established decree—an authority for the denomination from which henceforth and for ever may be no appeal—ONCE MORE without refutation promulgated ; ay ! was, as the result too indisputably bears witness, ONCE MORE very generally exalted.

I have said an *established decree* ; an authority from which within the pale of the P. R. Baptist Churches may *henceforth and for ever* be no appeal. But to this idea of perpetuity, it is not improbable that exception may be taken. By anticipation therefore, I submit, if after the lapse of thirty-one years from the date of its original acceptance, this highly objectionable document may as a standard of practice for the ministry be reproduced—may again without censure be promulgated—again by general tacit consent approved and ratified—Why not fifty, a hundred, a thousand years hence ? At the most remote of the periods mentioned, the Scriptures, it must be granted, will upon the point of the ministry furnish no additional light beyond that which they furnish now. And if notwithstanding the aggregate of light afforded by the Word now, the extract under consideration *may* after so long be as a standard for the ministry re-exalted,—may as a righteous authority by which to fix evangelical practice be deemed final,—why not at any other period,—ay ! the most distant conceivable ? Let him who objects show why.

And now, holding up to the mind of the reader this reproduction of the error—but *more particularly its second triumphant reception*—RECEPTION BY THE SAID CHURCHES IN THE SHAPE OF AN ESTABLISHED DECREE—I steadfastly aver, that in this fact he has the absolute proof of that which on a former page I pledged myself most satisfactorily to establish, viz., that as *I read* Mr. Philpot, and as *tens of thousands besides read*, the feeble palliative which in his offensive teaching has by the learned gentleman been adopted, is but a thing of *air* ; while THE JUDGMENT which magisterially he delivers, is by its every reader thoroughly understood to be—POSITIVE—FINAL—ABSOLUTE.

But for this obstinate exalting of error in the form of a statute or decree from which is in future to be no appeal, it is more than probable that my pen had never been directed against it : for to speak truth, I knew not of that error's existence. The eminent person by whom it had been penned, had passed to his rest while I was yet labouring among the Mahommedans of Hindostan, and with the substance of his published Works I was all-but-utterly unacquainted. The teaching consequently might have slept, as most fit, in the womb of oblivion, *if for the express purpose of perpetuating that antagonism to the wisdom, will, and sovereign right of God, to*

justify which it was in 1841 originally excogitated, it had not again been raked up—reproduced—re-disseminated: again thrust upon the credulous and unreflecting in the P. R. Baptist Churches, AS A DECREE FOR THE MINISTRY, RIGHTEOUS—AUTHORITATIVE—FINAL.

I shall not pursue the humbling theme further. Suffice it in conclusion to say, that notwithstanding the sacrifice of great part of my evidence, as originally adduced against the unhallowed Extract here analyzed, I feel confident that ample yet remains, to establish the judgment by that Extract propounded, antisciptural, unholy, and toward the wisdom, will, and sovereign right of God, absolutely treasonable. To the equity of the sanctified reader I leave the imperative duty of judging the Error: to the uncompromising Judge in the great and fearful day, this high testimony in its condemnation. u

CHAPTER II.

THAT EXTRAORDINARY THEORY, BY WHICH THE ANTISCRIPTURAL TEACHING IN THE PREVIOUS CHAPTER REPUDIATED HAS WITH A VIEW TO ITS JUSTIFICATION BEEN UNAVAILINGLY BACKED, THOROUGHLY SCRUTINIZED AND EXPLODED.

BEFORE touching the highly unsatisfactory theory with which in the course of this inquiry I have next to deal—that theory through which the practice of not ministering the gospel as by Jehovah commanded is in the P. R. Baptist Churches justified—it may, in a difficulty which Mr. Philpot is candid enough to admit was by himself and brethren very painfully felt, first of all seem an act of justice, to suffer that eminent person to speak for himself. I have the pleasure therefore to record his opening statement, in which the difficulty in question is very clearly exhibited.

He says,—“For instance, *the Scriptures ARE FULL OF GENERAL EXHORTATIONS TO MEN to perform what certainly appear, AT FIRST SIGHT, spiritual actions.* ‘Repent and turn yourselves from all your transgressions.’ ‘Make you a new heart and a new spirit; for why will ye die, O house of Israel?’ (Ezek. xviii. 30, 31.) ‘Repent ye, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.’ (Matt. iii. 2.) ‘Repent ye, and believe the gospel.’ (Mark i. 15.) ‘Repent, therefore, of this thy wickedness: and pray God if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee.’ (Acts viii. 22.) *These and similar passages UNDOUBTEDLY CALL UPON NATURAL MEN to repent, believe, and pray, all which are spiritual acts, and as such can only be performed by spiritual persons, and by them only when and as God worketh in them to will and to do of His good pleasure.* Now

these passages are AS MUCH a part of God's word as those which set forth the glorious DOCTRINES OF GRACE, or as those which describe the experience of the quickened family. There they are, whether we like them or not; and we believe that many Calvinists have as much wished them out of the word as Arminians have wished the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans blotted out of the Bible. . . Any help, then, in this deeply important matter, any sound and scriptural contribution to remove these difficulties, any real approach to disentangle this perplexing question, we desire to receive thankfully. The enemies of truth, it is well known, entrench themselves in these strongholds; and though many affect to despise them because used by erroneous men to prop up error, it can never be safe to despise the texts which they advance." (pp. 52, 53.)

The difficulty to which on behalf of himself and brethren the Rev. gentleman in the above passage alludes, abstracted from his other remarks and set forth in concise language is, to discover for the general or indiscriminate exhortations which Jehovah has seen fit to address to the masses, *such interpretation as shall effectually pluck those texts out of the hands of Arminians, AND JUSTIFY ULTRA CALVINISTS IN THE PRACTICE OF NOT (AS BY GOD COMMANDED) MINISTERING THE GOSPEL MESSAGE TO EVERY CREATURE*; seeing that except under vouchsafement of sovereign grace by the Holy Spirit, that message is never by the hearers truly obeyed.

Such the difficulty, for effectual removal of which Mr. Philpot advances his theory. That theory, with a view to the information of the reader—I dare not say his edification—I now in the learned gentleman's language record. But for clearness sake I omit a long parenthetical passage, in which this gifted man answers a certain objection to his views, which he anticipates as likely to be by an opponent raised. I say, I omit this: because it forms no part of the theory itself—is of no importance to it—but only calculated, by withdrawing the attention of the inquirer from it, to confuse.

THE THEORY TO BE SCRUTINIZED.

"Admitting in the fullest extent both God's moral government and man's responsibility, *we consider the gospel as a SPECIAL REVELATION to the elect*, and therefore distinct from either the one or the other. We do not deny that man's responsibility is increased by there being in the gospel a clearer revelation, (witnessed by miracles and other evidences that are appreciable by natural men) of God's anger against sin. . . . But viewed as a SPECIAL REVELATION of mercy and grace to the elect seed, we consider the gospel as quite distinct from either God's moral government, or man's

responsibility. If so, *then all the spiritual exhortations connected with the gospel will be equally distinct*, and will be founded not upon man's responsibility, but upon God's eternal purposes of mercy to a chosen remnant. **AND NOW COMES** what we believe to be **THE TRUE SOLUTION** of exhortations to spiritual actions addressed in the Old and New Testaments to natural men. We look upon these exhortations, invitations, calls, and so on, to be lodged in the Scriptures, as in a vast reservoir and magazine of truth, *out of which the Blessed Spirit, from time to time, takes such portions as he sees fit*, to quicken, convince, teach, rebuke, or comfort the spiritual seed. For instance the Lord said, 'Strive to enter in at the strait gate.' This exhortation might have been blessed to elect souls at the time it dropped from His gracious lips ; but whether it was or not, it has been lodged by the Holy Spirit in the vast magazine of truth, the sacred Scriptures. Here, then, *it stands as a sword in the scabbard in that heavenly armoury*, **WHOLLY AND SOLELY FOR THE SPIRIT'S USE**, who, as He sees fit, employs it to divide between soul and spirit and joints and marrow. Who shall say that there are not thousands to whom that text has been useful ? Who can say it has not been a means of quickening hundreds into spiritual life ? Here, then, we find the use of these general exhortations, corresponding with that text, (2 Tim. iii. 16, 17,) 'All scripture is given by inspiration of God,' &c. . . . We look, then, upon exhortations both *general* and *special* as a part, and a very necessary part, of the sacred volume, *and to be used by the Spirit just in the same manner as promises, doctrines, and so on*, **FOR THE EDIFICATION OF THE CHURCH OF GOD.**" (pp. 81, 82.)

This theory—despite the consequential tones in which it is recorded—the far too lofty air beneath which it is masked—is yet, I gladly bear the eminent propounder witness, submitted under expression of doubt as to its infallibility. For with a highly commendable measure of self-suspicion, he adds, "Whether our solution or not be correct, whether it remove the difficulty or not, must be left ; but we put it forth as a nearer approximation to clearing up an acknowledged enigma than Mr. Wells's attempt to reconcile general exhortations with free grace principles. (p. 83.)

Abstracted from parenthetical matter, this hypothesis obtrudes on our attention three distinct propositions : and these, set forth in concise terms, are as follows. First—That the gospel is a revelation which *is special, being* **TO THE ELECT ALONE** : secondly—That all the spiritual exhortations connected with the gospel *are equally special, that is*, **ARE ADDRESSED TO THE ELECT ALONE** : and thirdly—That these exhortations, invitations, calls, &c., which are to the elect alone, *are lodged in the Scriptures as in a vast reservoir or maga-*

zine of truth, WHOLLY AND SOLELY FOR THE SPIRIT'S USE, who, as He sees fit, is to apply them to the elect.

The above three propositions, complete the theory advanced by Mr. Philpot. It is therefore my imperative duty to take each in the order in which it stands, and subject it to strict and impartial investigation.

With regard to the two first, I request the reader very particularly to note, that they are of minor importance; are by the learned author himself evidently considered so to be. For it is not until he reaches the third and grand head of his theory, that he magnifies his matter; taking pains to commend it to notice under announcement—"AND NOW COMES what we believe to be THE TRUE SOLUTION of exhortations to spiritual actions addressed in the Old and New Testaments to natural men." The two first heads, therefore, being by the Rev. gentleman himself considered as of minor importance, I shall not at very great length dwell upon them. Suffice it, as briefly as may be, to make manifest to the inquirer their true value.

First,—"*The gospel is a special revelation of mercy and grace to the elect—AND TO THEM ALONE.*" Is this proposition true—or, is it nakedly and palpably erroneous? To bring the matter to proof, I submit the following necessary inquiry, viz., In the true sense of the question at issue—the sense in which Mr. Philpot is here speaking—what *is* a revelation? As simple a definition as can be given, is perhaps the following. A revelation is,—A discovery through means of writing made by God to the creature, of certain truths concerning which the creature was in profound ignorance; and to the knowledge of which, except by vouchsafement of such divine writing, the creature could by no possibility attain. So much for a mere revelation: but next and more particularly, What is a *gospel* revelation? A gospel revelation is,—Such a writing as the above, in which the truths of Jehovah's mercy to sinners—the righteous way of that mercy through the sacrifice of the incarnate Son—together with the divine injunctions in connection with the Son's sacrifice—are made known to the creature. So much for the meaning of a gospel revelation, as considered in connection with the general exhortations. But a gospel revelation being exactly that which I have affirmed it to be, therefore, by virtue of the infinite wisdom inherent in the Deity it is evident, that that revelation must have had an express *destination*: that is, it must either have been sent to teach of mercy, and the righteous way of mercy, THE ELECT IN PARTICULAR; or it must have been sent to teach of mercy, and the righteous way of mercy, MANKIND AT LARGE. One or the other of these ideas, it will be admitted, necessarily represents *the*

destination of the gospel revelation. The question is, Which? That the ground beneath our feet may be sure, I ask, What saith the Scripture? What representation gives Jehovah, with regard to that destination which has by Himself been ordained for the gospel? As by the unerring lips of Christ delivered, its destination is as follows: "*Go ye therefore (ye apostles and servants of the Lamb) and TEACH ALL NATIONS.*" (Matt. xxviii. 19.) And again at the same venerable lips: "*Go ye into ALL THE WORLD and preach the gospel TO EVERY CREATURE.*" (Mark xvi. 15.) Now if the testimony of this noble witness be admitted, then, the destination of the gospel revelation is before us,—and none may presume to alter it. Upon the strength of this imperial mandate I affirm, that the true and lawful destination of the written revelation called the gospel, is firmly and irrevocably fixed; fixed beyond the power of creatures—the noblest—to reverse or change. And that destination which in the iron of divine decree has thus been fixed, is not as by the theory asserted *special*, or to the elect alone, but *general*, or to the kindreds of the earth at large; expressed more particularly still by the words, "*all the world,*" and, "*every creature.*" If language be admitted to have a definite meaning, then, these imperative utterances at the lips of Christ must on behalf of Jehovah be held to express a real behest. Moreover, that behest can have but one meaning: the expression, "*all nations,*" indisputably designating the several tribes or communities of men as distinguished from each other by possession of a common language; the sister expression, "*all the world,*" with equal clearness signifying the various tribes or communities thus by language distinctively marked as in the aggregate dwelling upon the face of the earth, while the more particular expression, "*every creature,*" with equal plainness points to individual members of the several tribes and communities mentioned—even all and as many as in their world-wide wanderings the faithful preachers of the gospel might encounter. Now this declaration with regard to the destination of the *glad tidings* or *gospel*, as by the lips of Christ delivered, will, if the reader take the trouble to examine, be found accurately to correspond with both the angelic and apostolic account of that destination, and to be thereby corroborated. For at the hand of God's angel it has thus been delivered,—“Behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be TO ALL PEOPLE. For unto you is born this day in the city of David A SAVIOUR, WHICH IS CHRIST THE LORD.” (Luke ii. 10, 11.) In exact accordance with which truth, it has also at the hand of the great Apostle of the Gentiles been as below testified,—“Because we trust in the Living God, who is THE SAVIOUR OF ALL MEN, SPECIALLY OF THOSE (THE

ELECT) that believe." (1 Tim. iv. 10.) Upon indisputable evidence therefore I lay it down, that the destination of the written revelation called the gospel, is **TO THE NATIONS OF THE WORLD AT LARGE**. But the nations in the aggregate are *not* the elect of God; neither is the world, nor every creature, *chosen* to spiritual union with Christ. If these then be *not* the elect of God, *not* in the wisdom of the Father ordained to the Spirit's grace and effectual union with the Son, and yet the written revelation of the gospel be by imperial mandate sent to them, Upon what warrant does the very eminent Mr. Philpot proceed when he affirms, *that the gospel is a special revelation of mercy and grace to the elect; its destination to them, and them ALONE?*

In the first head of this theory, it will now from the above evidence be very clearly seen, that through failing with all diligence to clear his path by taking heed thereto according to Jehovah's word, this distinguished writer has brought himself into extremely unhappy collision with the mandate of his Redeemer. The case being thus, to every spiritual follower of Christ it is imperative, that the Son of God in His explicitly-revealed command be held to be *right*; His creature, however highly in other branches of divine truth distinguished, in this particular point absolutely *wrong*.

In the first of its several heads as now examined, the theory under review being seen to be wholly irreconcilable with that sole true standard of guidance the Word of God, it is to be abandoned: is to be considered in its own true character, to wit, as a mere deduction of natural reason—an emanation of the uninspired creature brain.

With a view however to strengthen the evidence against this first head of the theory, I have judged it right to append a number of admissions collected from the argument of Mr. Philpot himself, confirmatory of the position here established, and altogether decisive.

Mark then, that this learned gentleman recalling the attention of Mr. Wells to the real, the only point at issue, says, "The whole controversy is upon the meaning of **THE GENERAL EXHORTATIONS**." (p. 177.) General exhortations! What then, I ask, makes an evangelical exhortation to be *general* and not special? There can be but one—one only answer: it is this. By its bearing on, or being addressed to *mankind in general*; and *NOT to the elect in particular*. If it be absurdly objected, "Nay; not by its bearing on mankind at large, but in a general way on the elect!" then, I reply, were that true, there would be no such thing as a general exhortation; all would then become special. But the learned Mr. Philpot admits that there *are* general exhortations;

may ! many such. I therefore very humbly submit, If the destination of the written revelation called the gospel be *not* as the mandate of Christ would appear to indicate—to the nations of the earth—to the world—and to every creature—but special, or to the elect of God alone, then, how, let it be shewn, is it possible for the exhortations of a gospel revelation *which* IS SPECIAL, to BECOME GENERAL ? In order to any single passage of a gospel revelation being *general*, it is absolutely indispensable that the destination of the revelation which contains it should be to the nations—the world—and to every creature. For supposing the written revelation called the gospel to be special, or sent to the elect alone, then, in a revelation which is altogether *special*, a revelation sent to the elect alone, it would not be possible that any exhortation should become *general*, or relative to mankind at large ? By granting therefore the fact, that there are in the gospel revelation such things as *general* exhortations, it is plain, that in the first head of his theory, to wit, that the gospel is a special revelation to the elect, the erudite Mr. Philpot most decisively bears witness AGAINST HIMSELF.

Again, in the same connexion this eminent writer is found to say, “Those of the Gentiles to whom the *word of God* has come are either elect or reprobate.” (p. 177.) Here is a clear admission that the gospel revelation *has come* to reprobate parties as well as those who are elect. But if the divinely ordained destination of the gospel revelation be indeed as by Mr. Philpot affirmed, *special*, or to the elect alone, how happens it that that revelation which was by God ordained *special*, should go forth to reprobates of the Gentiles ? Does the written revelation called the gospel GO ABROAD EXACTLY CONTRARY TO ITS DIVINELY DECREED DESTINATION ? or is it rather more reasonable, more in accordance with fact to suppose, that here again this learned gentleman at unawares bears witness AGAINST HIMSELF ?

In the same connexion still this very eminent man avers, “But we have never denied the *general use* of Scripture. Outward Christianity has been the greatest possible blessing to the human race. The moral influence of the Bible has spread far and wide through society, and even now is transforming the cannibals and murderers of the Pacific Ocean into human and civilized beings.” (p. 178.) Here again is open acknowledgment of a *general use* in connexion with the written revelation called the gospel : that use, the spread of outward Christianity : the result of that outward Christianity, *such and such benignant effects*. But if such blessed effects be the undoubted result of outward Christianity—and if this outward Christianity be, and can only be raised up through the written revelation called the gospel

—and if, as Mr. Philpot himself admits, the gospel *has* after this general fashion been preached, and the God-glorifying temporal results mentioned *have* followed, then, I ask, *Is all this benevolence apart from God, or is it by God?* To be plainer still, If indeed as by the theory asserted, the gospel be a revelation which is *special*, or limited to the elect alone, then, is the *general* use of it here admitted, and are the brilliant moral effects which as a fruit of its general use are here witnessed, to be understood as transpiring in the world IN ABSOLUTE DEFIANCE OF THAT DIVINELY LIMITED DESTINATION, which has by the never-erring Jehovah been for His gospel so expressly decreed? Or rather, does the learned Mr. Philpot for the third time bear witness AGAINST HIMSELF?

Hard upon the extract immediately preceding, this learned gentleman once more as follows delivers himself. "Nor has Mr. Wells convinced us of the weakness of the argument that we employed to shew that *general exhortations* are not useless because *those to whom they ARE ADDRESSED lack power to perform them.*" (p. 178.) In this passage, as in the foregoing, are two distinct admissions: the first, that there are such things as *general exhortations*; the second, that these exhortations are *expressly addressed* to such parties as lack power to perform them, that is, to unregenerate persons, both of the elect and non-elect. I therefore see fit to ask, If the written revelation called the gospel, be as the theory asserts, *special*, or to the elect alone, how comes it to pass, first, that a revelation which by eternal decree is distinguished AS SPECIAL, should contain exhortations which ARE GENERAL? and secondly, *how in the divine decree's defiance this revelation which is SO SPECIAL, comes to be addressed to the NON-ELECT—to parties having no power to obey?* Is God defeated? is this in ABSOLUTE DEFIANCE OF THAT DIVINELY LIMITED DESTINATION, which has by the never-erring Jehovah been for His gospel most expressly decreed? Or rather, is it a fact, fact too evident to admit of denial, that here also at unawares the gifted Mr. Philpot bears witness AGAINST HIMSELF?

Once more subverting with high hand his adversary this accomplished gentleman thus reasons. "Now, if only half believed, it would constitute many; and the *other half* would remain standing witnesses to disprove Mr. Wells' assertion, that the Lord DOES NOT EXHORT TO SPIRITUAL ACTS *any in whose hearts he does not intend to begin and carry on his work.* That he does not apply his exhortations to any others we firmly hold, but that in the Scriptures *spiritual exhortations* ARE CONFINED TO SUCH, *we positively deny.*" (p. 180.) In this plain passage are these several admissions: first, that though half the crowd that heard the

preaching of Peter believed not, yet were they by the apostle *spiritually exhorted*: secondly, that by this fact, the assertion of Mr. Wells that the Lord does not exhort to spiritual acts *any save the elect*, is disproved: and thirdly, that Mr. Philpot positively denies that in the Scriptures spiritual exhortations *are confined to the elect*. But if the written revelation called the gospel be as by the theory affirmed, *special*, or to the elect alone, then, *Does Jehovah by his GOSPEL ACT contravene his own GOSPEL DECREE?* In plain words, are the things here admitted, to wit, that preaching of the inspired Peter to those who believed not—that design of God to exhort those in whom He does not by special grace intend to work—and that non-confinement in the Scriptures of spiritual exhortations to the elect—things which have existence apart from, **NAY! IN ABSOLUTE DEFIANCE OF THAT DIVINELY LIMITED DESTINATION**, which has, by Jehovah himself been for His gospel most expressly decreed? Or is it rather true, that the learned author of the theory which I repudiate has for the fifth time borne witness **AGAINST HIMSELF?**

But if to relieve the theory of Mr. Philpot from this pressure it be pleaded, that the learned gentleman could never have meant the **WRITTEN REVELATION** called the gospel, but its inward and spiritual revelation—its manifestation through grace of the Holy Spirit to the heart—then, I reply, carefully consider each of the extracts above recorded, and say whether any one of them will bear application to the inward manifestation of the gospel. At a single glance it must be seen that it will *not*. But be the intent of this illustrious scholar whatever it may, that which I have affirmed is not thereby to be overthrown: to wit, that the written revelation called the gospel is *not* special; is *not* to the elect alone; but contrariwise is *universal*; extending to every part of the habitable globe to which, in the course of divine providence the preachers of Christ may eventually be sent. But I here dismiss the first head of Mr. Philpot's theory: let us turn to the second.

Secondly,—Because of the special character supposed to belong to the revelation called the gospel, therefore, *all the spiritual exhortations therein contained are EQUALLY SPECIAL—that is, are as certainly addressed to THE ELECT ALONE*. Not again to refer to the foregoing admissions of this illustrious man, all of which in actual terms contradict this assertion, it will by every trained mind be at a glance seen, that the integrity of this proposition must stand or fall by the standing or falling of the former: for the former is the premise, the foundation upon which it has been set up. A foundation, even in the material world, being rotten, the superstructure ignorantly or wilfully reared thereon necessarily

falls. So also in the world logical. If the premise be false, the demonstration, however irrefragable, which may be set up thereon, is vitiated—becomes absolutely worthless. For in order to the satisfactory proof of a question, it is not enough that the reasoning by which the conclusion is developed be perfect : over and above such correct and consistent reasoning it is essential, that the premise, the leading proposition upon which such reasoning proceeds should be, if not indeed self-evident, yet at least indisputable and sound. Short of these requisites, to wit, sound premise, logical argument, and just conclusion, proof is but fallacious—untrustworthy—valueless.

In deciding therefore with respect to the claims of this second head of Mr. Philpot's theory, it is simply sufficient, that by careful examination of the demonstration which has been submitted in refutation of its first, the reader thoroughly satisfy himself as to whether I have or have not scripturally subverted it. If upon examination he should find that I *have*, then, he need be under no further anxiety with regard to this second ; but may, since the two stand or fall together, with perfect safety account it to be altogether void.

With a view however to show, that were there no other evidence against it, the admissions of the learned Mr. Philpot himself are to this second head of his theory absolutely fatal, I proceed to adduce instances.

Observe then, that in open antagonism to his own express assertion, to wit, "that the gospel, being A SPECIAL revelation to the elect, all the spiritual exhortations therein recorded ARE EQUALLY SPECIAL," I find in the very first sentence by which at the outset of his "Review" this accomplished writer opens up the subject with which he is about to deal, a plain contradiction of that assertion. He says, "For instance the Scriptures ARE FULL OF GENERAL EXHORTATIONS TO MEN (that is, in the mass) to perform what certainly appear, at first sight, spiritual actions : " of which exhortations having instanced a few, he adds, "these and similar passages undoubtedly CALL UPON NATURAL MEN (that is, in the mass) to repent, believe, and pray, all which are spiritual acts." (p. 52.) Here at least is open, public concession of the fact, that the spiritual exhortations of the gospel are by the Holy Scriptures actually and incessantly addressed to natural men—to the masses—without distinction and without difference. Now after plainly admitting this fact, how I submit comes it to pass, that the same talented individual thus plainly making the admission, should with his own pen give us to understand, "That the gospel being a revelation which is SPECIAL, or to the elect alone, all the spiritual exhortations therein contained are EQUALLY

SPECIAL"—that is, are as certainly addressed TO THE ELECT ALONE?

But again, in the second half of his "Review" published but one month later, I once more find this distinguished scholar in the following passage plainly contradicting himself. Let the reader very carefully mark it: he says, "He (Mr. Wells) therefore labours hard to prove, *that there are no GENERAL CALLS to the performance of spiritual acts*, and that the exhortation to 'repent and believe the gospel' means nothing more than a call to natural faith and natural repentance. He finds, however, one very intractable passage, 'Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life.'" (p. 80.) Now what I ask have we here? First, an acknowledgment of the fact, that there are *general* calls (that is, calls *not* special, *not* to the elect alone): secondly, that these general calls are to the performance of *spiritual acts*: and thirdly, that the text instanced from the Gospel of John is *too stubborn* for the ingenuity of Mr. Wells himself to misrepresent or pervert. Yet upon the immediately following page, the very same writer seems not to consider it self-contradiction to assert, that the gospel being A SPECIAL REVELATION of mercy to the elect, all the spiritual exhortations contained therein ARE EQUALLY SPECIAL, that is are addressed to THE ELECT ALONE.

Once more (and I might go on to enumerate until space failed) I find on the page last quoted—the very same upon which the second head of Mr. Philpot's theory is recorded—the following. "But this is not the only passage that stands as an iron pillar against Mr. Wells's system. . . What shall we say to the two following passages? 'While ye have the light, believe in the light, that ye may be the children of light.' (John xii. 36.) Is not spiritual faith here spoken of? Are not 'the children of light' especially opposed to 'the children of this world?' (Luke xvi. 8.) *But were not those to whom it was addressed persons in a natural state?* For proof that they were, see context, verses 37—41. Again, 'Strive to enter in at the strait gate; for many, I say unto you, shall seek to enter in and shall not be able.' (Luke xiii. 24.) Who can deny that this referred to spiritual striving? *and yet that it was addressed (that is, in a general way) to natural persons* is plain from the context. (See verses 25—28.)" Now what be it asked are the several acknowledgments before us in this passage? I answer, these. First, that *spiritual faith*, and *spiritual striving* to enter in at the strait gate, are intended: secondly, that the call of Christ to such spiritual faith and spiritual striving is addressed indiscriminately to the masses—to men in a natural state: and thirdly, that the whole of the lengthy contexts to which the writer points, undeniably prove that such parties were in the

natural state asserted. Such the very candid admissions in the passage under consideration : yet most marvellous to record, on the very same page, and only a few lines lower down on that page stands the absolutely contradictory assertion, "that the gospel being a revelation which IS SPECIAL, or to the elect alone, all the spiritual exhortations therein contained ARE EQUALLY SPECIAL, that is, are addressed to THE ELECT ALONE."

Upon the strength of the testimony here recorded, I now affirm, that both by Scripture and the admissions of the accomplished Mr. Philpot himself, I have very effectually subverted the two leading heads of that writer's theory. I turn forthwith to the third : that by a thorough digest of this hypothesis in its third and last head, I may, in the presence of the Churches, make manifest its real value. This third head let the reader remember, embodies the very marrow of the Rev. gentleman's wisdom : is the intellectual key which for the solving of their difficulty, he presents the High Calvinistic Baptist Churches.

Thirdly,—"We look upon these exhortations, invitations, calls, and so on, *to be lodged in the Scriptures, as in a vast reservoir and magazine of truth, WHOLLY AND SOLELY FOR THE SPIRIT'S USE*, who, as he sees fit, takes them from time to time, to quicken, convince, teach, rebuke, or comfort the spiritual seed—that is, the souls of the elect." Such the third or grand head of that theory, which as a door of escape from an undisguised dilemma, the learned Mr. Philpot (without, however, adducing necessary scriptural proof) sees fit to propound to the P. R. Baptist Churches. And this baseless conceit, I regret to be under positive obligation to say, has been adopted as an adequate ground on which, to justify disobedience to the mandate of Jehovah. I proceed to its analysis.

The first exception to this particular head of the theory which I find it absolutely necessary to take, is,—That while laying claim to the honour of solving what the learned Mr. Philpot has been pleased to call "the acknowledged enigma" of the general exhortations, *the truth really is, that it does not even remotely TOUCH THAT QUESTION.*

Any reader, the least intelligent, who shall be at the trouble to examine will find, that Mr. Philpot's speculations are confined (exclusively) to a totally different matter, to wit, THE SPECIAL, THE MYSTERIOUS, THE DIVINE OPERATION OF THE HOLY GHOST IN THE ELECT. Beyond this, it does not advance. To the grand question of the general exhortations, with which Mr. Wells had so unsuccessfully endeavoured to grapple, and which forms the only point in dispute, this talented gentleman condescends not even to refer. All that he deigns to tell us—and I conclude no regenerate party ever yet doubted it—is, "that spiritual exhortations are to be

found lodged in the Bible, and that the Holy Spirit at his pleasure makes use of them on the souls of the elect." It may possibly excite a smile, but really this is the whole sum, the entire substance of the information which has by this highly accomplished scholar been vouchsafed.

It must then by every intelligent party be recognized, that the learned Mr. Philpot has neither attempted to treat the case of the *non-elect*, nor touch the question of the *general exhortations* which bear upon them: but instead of attempting to deal with either difficulty, HAS STUDIOUSLY THRUST FORWARD THE CASE OF THE ELECT. From which, it is manifest, and must be granted, that he has altogether forsaken the true point at issue—that point on which, by this express head of his theory, he had professed to cast light. For *such* point, I affirm, has no connexion whatever with the mysterious action of the Holy Spirit in the elect—to wit, His inward operation by regenerating grace on the heart—concerning which, all parties being agreed, there is absolutely no possibility of dispute. It is therefore my imperative duty to the reader to point out, that in every attempt which has been made to justify the practice of not preaching the gospel as by God commanded, whether at the hand of Mr. Philpot, Dr. Hawker, Mr. Wells, or any other, it invariably happens, that the champion of that way is for lack of evidence and argument constrained to ignore *the true, the only point at issue*, viz., the divine wisdom, will, and mandate in connexion with the non-elect; while as a blind he thrusts forward another matter, on which not only is there no difference but the most cordial agreement, to wit, JEHOVAH'S MERCY TO THE ELECT. In which significant circumstance, we have, I say not mere tacit admission, but open, practical proof of the fact, that the antisciptural dogma for which such teachers contend IS ABSOLUTELY INDEFENSIBLE.

The second exception to this particular head of the theory which I find it absolutely necessary to take, is,—That not only as shown does it *not* touch the question of the general exhortations, *but that its real object is to confuse the inquirer, and to the fullest extent to which that is possible*, HINDER, AY! RESOLUTELY EXCLUDE EVERYTHING LIKE IMPARTIAL INVESTIGATION.

For the indisputable proof of this assertion, I call attention to the fact, that while by the learned Mr. Philpot this third head of theory has as a solution of the difficulty of the general exhortations been to the credulous and unwary commended, yet the eminent gentleman never once condescends to recognize, deigns not for a single moment to regard the chief instrument of God's choice in the regeneration—the grand ordinance of PUBLIC PREACH-

ING. And why? Because this illustrious man was far too well versed in the science of controversy not to perceive, that by the faintest allusion to direct the attention of the inquirer to *that* ordinance, must of necessity end in the ruin of his cause. He was therefore constrained to ignore this leading feature of the case—THIS PUBLIC PREACHING. Mark the evasion, and let its full significance be apprehended. In a question which touches the very vitals of the wisdom, will, and sovereign right of God, this accomplished scholar instead of at once proceeding to grapple with the real, the only point upon which dispute can possibly arise, viz., the instrumental or *human use* of the gospel, forthwith swerves aside to the *use divine*; its irresistible application by the Holy Spirit to the heart. Now at the conscience of every candid, every regenerate person I demand, What has this question of the inward, secret, mysterious action of God on the elect, to do with that other question, to wit, *Creature use of the ordinance of PUBLIC PREACHING—the act of testifying by voice to the outward ear of sinners the VERBAL MESSAGE of the gospel?* Will any man laying claim to a modicum of scriptural knowledge presume to deny, that for carrying out upon earth the grand work of the regeneration, the chiefest of the ordinances of Jehovah is the public preaching of the gospel? If in face of the infallible Scriptures this cannot be disputed, then, the simple and the only question which remains is, Upon what pattern are the servants of Christ to conduct this divine ordinance—this PUBLIC PREACHING? Is it to be THAT which has by the Son of God and His inspired Apostles been set before us? or is it to be SOME OTHER, which man pretending to a wisdom greater than that of the Son of God and his Apostles, would pronounce to be far better? In discussing the question of the general exhortations therefore, not dogmatically, but most righteously I insist, that the sole point claiming to be established is, THE RIGHT OR SCRIPTURAL METHOD OF PUBLIC PREACHING.

If this be true, then, nothing can be clearer than the fact, that in this particular question we have *not* to do with the Bible as a vast reservoir of divine truth for the Spirit's use, but, as an infallible instrument by which to fix, settle, determine, *the right method of ministering to man the verbal message of salvation.* And again, in this particular question our concern is not with that which is exclusively the work of Deity, the Holy Spirit's almighty operation in the hearts of the elect, but simply with the instrumental part of Jehovah's work, the *imperative duty of making known the gospel to the perishing.* Nothing therefore can be clearer than the fact, that THE POINT in this inquiry which it was Mr. Philpot's imperative duty to treat, was, that of PUBLIC PREACHING. And of this fact, no one I submit possessed of intellectual power such as

characterized *this* eminent man, could by any possibility be in ignorance. But not only do I contend that the learned gentleman must have been cognizant of *this* fact, but that he knew the point in question to be such, *that in the most casual way* to venture to treat, or even to touch upon it, must prove absolutely ruinous, first, to his boasted theory, and secondly, to that highly reprehensible practice which the theory was excogitated to defend. Hence with determination to establish *that*, in support of which (as his incorruptible judgment bore witness) there existed no shadow of scriptural warrant, he altogether evades the real—the *only* point in dispute; and continues to occupy his own mind, and the minds of his readers, with a subject wholly foreign to that point. That this may appear, let the reader with all care examine the theory of this eminent gentleman, as word for word I have recorded it, and see whether throughout there is to be found the slightest approach, the merest reference to the grand ordinance of the regeneration, **THE PUBLIC PREACHING OF THE GOSPEL.**

But to go farther. Not only is there in this third head of Mr. Philpot's theory that deliberate ignoring of the ordinance of public preaching to which I point, but worse: it contains, I affirm, a statement for the complete and permanent overthrow of that ordinance. For, mark, instancing the celebrated passage, "Strive to enter in at the strait gate," as one of those general exhortations which have by the Spirit been lodged in the Bible, it is said, "Here then it stands as a sword in the scabbard in that heavenly armoury, **WHOLLY AND SOLELY FOR THE SPIRIT'S USE.**" (p. 82.) In this passage we have it positively asserted, that the exhortation in question has been placed in the Bible, entirely, and exclusively, for application by the Spirit of God; consequently not for ministerial or instrumental use; which latter use we are elsewhere given to understand, is an offence just as grave, as the attempt of a profane party to usurp Jehovah's prerogative and work miracles. But if this be the case with the passage "Strive to enter in at the strait gate," then equally so with that other text, "Labour not for the meat that perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life": and if with that also, then by the same rule, with every similar passage within the boards of the Bible. From each, and from all, ministerial or instrumental right of use is dis severed: in plain words, the divinely appointed ordinance for the work of the regeneration, **THE PUBLIC PREACHING OF THE GOSPEL, IS ANNIHILATED.**

The third exception to this particular head of the theory which I feel under absolute necessity to take, is,—That while as in the immediately preceding objection clearly shown, the learned Mr.

Philpot expressly ignores the whole point in dispute, to wit, preaching, or the instrumental use of the gospel, he with equal deliberateness evades the plain fact, that the mass of the general exhortations of the Bible were neither by the Son of God himself uttered, nor yet by His prophets and apostles, with primary view to their insertion in the Bible for after use by the Holy Spirit; but for warning and instruction, were by living voice of the several speakers ADDRESSED TO THE DULL EARS—THE HARD HEARTS—OF THE UNCONVERTED, THE UNSPIRITUAL MASSES.

The ignoring, or holding back of this fact, has, as the learned gentleman could not but be well aware it would, the effect of preserving to the minds of his readers an air of consistency for this third head of theory, which otherwise it could by no possibility possess. For by holding back the significant fact to which I allude, those readers, while pursuing the even current of the eminent gentleman's thoughts, are kept with but one idea before the mind; and that, mark, an idea wholly foreign to the question at issue. They are amused I say with the idea, that God verily *did* lodge the exhortations general and particular in the Bible, with express view to their after use by the Holy Spirit. This, as far as the case of the elect is concerned, no person possessed of spiritual understanding ever attempts to deny. But, alas! it has nothing to do with the point in dispute: it is foreign. Being thus kept amused—thus drawn aside—thus steadfastly held down to a question wholly irrelevant to the point at issue, it never occurs to Mr. Philpot's readers, that quite apart from the Bible and ultimate use to be by the Holy Spirit made of that Bible, the great body of the general exhortations were by the Son of God, his Prophets, and his Apostles, BROUGHT FORTH BY THE WAYSIDES, IN THE MIDST OF CROWDS, IN THE MARKET-PLACES; and that, not with any primary design to their being for the use of the Spirit lodged in the Bible, but with immediate, with express view TO THE INSTRUCTION AND WARNING OF SINNERS. By absence of which idea, the minds of indiscriminating inquirers float calmly and unquestioningly with the current of the Rev. author's thoughts: altogether undisturbed by any side-breeze of objection, which, had they sailed under more faithful pilotage, had been certain to dissipate their highly undesirable calm. Thus at length it comes to be persistently held—nay! as an article of the Christian faith even obstinately defended—that the general exhortations are truths which from the beginning *have* stood, which at present *do* stand, which to the end of time *shall* stand within the boards of the Bible, "WHOLLY AND SOLELY FOR THE SPIRIT'S USE."

With a view therefore to defeat this system of evading—and by

evading effectually silencing—the witness of Scripture, I assume leave to submit the simple inquiry, Is the lodging of certain truths in the Bible for after use of the Spirit of God, one thing? and, *Is the proclaiming by living voice of those truths in public, with immediate view to the instruction and warning of the masses, quite another?* If, as I assume it must, a clear difference be on every side granted, then, once more I ask, Was the Son of God and his inspired Apostles engaged in the latter work or in the former, when those general exhortations with which the recorded fragments of their sermons are replete, were delivered in the world? If it be admitted, in the latter, then, here I submit is a fact **ALTOGETHER CONCLUSIVE IN THE GRAND QUESTION OF THE GENERAL EXHORTATIONS**, but which, in face of his expressed anxiety to throw light on this very question, the accomplished Mr. Philpot **SEES FIT ALTOGETHER TO ESCHEW**.

On the strength of the above evidence, I call upon every soul to whom the truth, will, and glory of God are dear, to take note, how persistently, how disingenuously in discussing this important question the light vouchsafed by the infallible Scriptures is discarded; to the end, *that RATIONALISTIC DEDUCTION may take precedence of Jehovah's word, and UNDER THE BOAST OF DIVINE TRUTH BE EXALTED*.

But what when candidly examined is the broad, the indisputable fact, which in connexion with wayside or general preaching Mr. Philpot so determines to ignore? This; let the reader mark, and treasure it up in his heart for ever. That the general exhortations under consideration — exhortations having exclusive reference to the soul's salvation—were by the Son of God and his Apostles brought forth, *not* with any primary view to their being for the Spirit's use lodged in the Bible; but, as preachers sent by God to the heathen, **IN THEIR DAILY MINISTRATION OF THE GOSPEL**. In short, were for the high end of instruction and warning, indiscriminately, and by the million, scattered among the careless and ignorant masses. While out of the mighty aggregate, the countless number thus daily, thus most liberally scattered, a few—a very few—have in those brief histories of the ministry and death of Christ called “The Gospels,” and that equally brief history of the ministry and doings of the Apostles called “The Book of Acts,” been gathered up, and for general information recorded. What a very different view of the case is here, to that which in the evasive theory which I am examining has by the erudite Mr. Philpot been suggested. In direct opposition therefore to the assertion contained in head third of that theory, I now with all the certainty of a mathematical axiom lay it down, That those general exhortations to the masses which form such a remarkable—**NAY! THE**

PROMINENT—feature of the gospel dispensation, were *not* as by our learned author asserted, made use of by the Son of God and his Apostles with primary view to their insertion in the Bible; but were with immediate design to the instruction and warning of the legal Jew, the idolatrous or heathen Gentile, PREACHED HOME TO THE CONSCIENCE AND THE HEART.

The fourth exception to this particular head of the theory which I feel under absolute necessity to take, is this,—That by arbitrarily abolishing in the grand work of the regeneration the instrumental department—that department which as much in benevolence as in authority the Lord has seen fit to commit to His people—THE REDEEMED CHURCH IS CLEAN ROBBED OF HER OFFICE.

In the second of the objections recorded against this head of Mr. Philpot's theory, I took occasion to show, that the divinely instituted ordinance of *public preaching* was not merely ignored, but that instrumentalities—all instrumentalities—were in effect *abolished*. The notion of the Rev. gentlemen it will be remembered was, first, that the Bible stands in the place of a spiritual armoury; secondly, that all the truths therein revealed stand in the position of a sword sheathed in that armoury; and thirdly, that to the Holy Spirit alone belongs the high prerogative to make use of these truths; ministerial use thereof being an act as truly culpable as the unauthorized attempt to work miracles. Here, then, as I have said, is an absolute end of instrumentalities. Adieu to our gospel labours: farewell to our tenderest anxieties: for now, through the wisdom of the illustrious writer before us we at length discover, that we have been spending our strength for nought; agonizing in vain endeavour to do that to which we were not called; wasting life and health on that, which it had been far more thankworthy to have let alone. Grant then for a single moment the idea contained in this third head of Mr. Philpot's theory to be true, and it follows, THAT THE CHURCH OF CHRIST IS DIVESTED OF HER OFFICE.

For myself however, I candidly confess, that I am not prepared tamely to surrender this immunity of my spiritual sonship: nor by conscious pandering to the pretension of human reason, accept as righteous the judgment of Mr. Philpot. I therefore see fit to inquire, Does that arbitrary abolition of instrumentality which forms the leading characteristic of head third of the learned gentleman's theory, correspond with the infinitely wise ordinations of God? To the law and the testimony. What saith the infallible Scripture? Is it not there by the finger of the inspiring God recorded,—“*And the SPIRIT and the BRIDE SAY, Come. And let HIM THAT HEARETH SAY, Come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely.*” (Rev. xxii.

17.) Here once more from the infallible word of God is deadly wound for the last or grand head of Mr. Philpot's theory. I would freely ask that gentleman himself, or any other candid, honourable man, whether this precious testimony at the hand of the beloved Apostle affords the faintest shadow of support, the feeblest ray of countenance, to the assumption which I am engaged in examining? Is it according to the infallible word a fact, that to the Spirit of God *alone* is reserved the right to make use of those general truths, which have by inspiration been lodged in the Scriptures? Do such truths indeed stand as a sheathed sword in that heavenly armoury, WHOLLY AND SOLELY FOR THE SPIRIT'S USE? If in this respect the opinion of the gifted Mr. Philpot were correct, then, Why, I submit, *in this general work of SAYING to all who pass by, "Come,"* has the redeemed Church, the Bride, been by the Spirit of God thus associated with Himself? And, mark, not merely the redeemed Church taken collectively as the Bride, but every individual member of that Church as considered apart—even every one that through grace has had the ear spiritually circumcised to hear: as it is written, "*and let HIM that heareth SAY, COME.*" He that contrary to the Scriptures persists in maintaining the groundless notion of Mr. Philpot, let *him* show why? But ere passing from this head of my subject it is right, that I set before the reader the full consequence of accepting this notion, and affecting to believe that every department of the work of the regeneration belongs *to the Spirit of God alone*. Let us take a practical view of the consequences; let us see in what results our acquiescence must infallibly land us.

First, then, yonder stands the Bible: and there within its enclosing boards as in a heavenly armoury stand the general exhortations, particular exhortations, doctrines, precepts, warnings—whatever may be supposed to pertain to the grand work of the regeneration—there they stand. And there, clear to the eye of imagination, stands or hovers the Holy Spirit, whose whole and sole prerogative it is (saith human wisdom) to make use of them. The divine Agent therefore being before us, and the Bible his thoroughly furnished armoury ready to his hand, and the work of bringing forth the weapons of that armoury, and with these effecting Jehovah's will being exclusively his, that is, being in no sense whatever the Bride's, it is evident according to this improved case that all things are ready: nothing more *is*, or *can* be needed. What follows? This. Since nothing of that which needs to be present is absent, Let the Spirit at pleasure make use of his own weapons—those weapons with which, in the armoury of the Bible, he is so amply furnished: let Him carry out, whenever, and on whomsoever He pleases, that which is necessary to be done.

He is a sovereign : is master of his own purposes—master of his own weapons—master of his own wisdom—master of his own time : let him do as seemeth to himself good. But the Bride having no part nor lot in the matter—the Bride having no right to draw forth a single weapon from the scabbard—the Bride having no right whatever to be impertinent or meddling—let her beware of the folly of in any way putting forth a rash hand. Let the private reading of individual members of her body be abandoned ; let her family meetings for household instruction and edification be discontinued ; let her more general gatherings for the now exploded ordinance of public preaching be abolished ; let her chapels be closed, locked up, or burnt down ; let her each particular member as far as ordinances are concerned fold his hands, shake his head, and steadily refuse to interest heart or mind more in the matter ; in short, let the general assembly and church of the first-born, the Bride elect of the Living God whose record is written on high, compose herself for dignified repose—lie down—and with perfect unconcern solace herself with the delights of slumber. Now this, supposing that the extraordinary theory of Mr. Philpot is to stand, I assert to be the logical, the legitimate, the inevitable issue of the case.

In full view of it, I ask all spiritually-minded parties, all those who through sanctification of the Spirit are made manifest as the true children of the bride-chamber, how they like this arrangement ? I call upon the Church of Christ, the Bride, to say how she relishes the contemptible position to which by this human improving upon that honourable position in the wisdom of God assigned her, she is in reality reduced ? The honourable position which in His eternal love the Lord appointed her was, That in the grand work of the regeneration she should be associated with her guardian and sanctifier the Holy Spirit—should be the pre-eminently honoured instrument in his hand to win souls to God—should be unto the Father a sweet savour of Christ in them that are saved and in them that perish—of life unto life on the one hand, and death unto death on the other. But the uncomely position to which by the theory of the eminent Mr. Philpot she is reduced is, That in the grand work of the regeneration she be but a despised vessel—a careless slumberer, not a vigilant spiritual witness—a bride altogether unhonoured and disregarded. Thus, by the wisdom of man, IS THE CHURCH OF CHRIST ROBBED OF HER OFFICE.

The fifth exception to this particular head of the theory which I feel it incumbent on me to take, is this. That by the absolute manner in which it annihilates the warrant of Christian instruments, *it does most unrighteously laugh to scorn the devoted service—*

condemn the life-long labour of love—BY MR. PHILPOT HIMSELF, AND BY ALL HIS MINISTERIAL BRETHERN, LAID DOWN AT THE REDEEMER'S FEET.

With a view in the simplest manner to make manifest the great wrong to which I point, I propose the question, Does this able divine *himself* ever preach? does *he* at any time as a messenger of the Lord Jesus Christ enter the pulpit and lift up in public his voice? I am told that he does: does so frequently.

In connexion with that fact, mark now the precise terms of this third head of the learned gentleman's theory: I shall for clearness sake arrange them under three distinct clauses. First, "that the general exhortations, invitations, calls, and so on, are lodged in the Scriptures as in a vast reservoir of truth, out of which the *Blessed Spirit* selects, as *he sees fit*, portions to quicken, convince, teach, rebuke, or comfort the spiritual seed." (p. 81.) Secondly, "that there (that is, in the Bible) as a sword in the scabbard these general passages stand, WHOLLY AND SOLELY FOR THE SPIRIT'S USE." (p. 82.) And thirdly, "that the learned theorist therefore looks upon exhortations, BOTH GENERAL AND SPECIAL, as part, and a very necessary part of the sacred volume, and to be used by the Spirit just in the same manner as PROMISES, DOCTRINES, ET CÆTERA, for the edification of the church of God." (p. 82.)

With regard to the above three propositions, let the reader be pleased to mark, that in the two first, exhortations, invitations, and so on, are reserved exclusively *for the use of the Holy Spirit*. But in the third, over and above this exclusive reservation to the Holy Spirit of right, it is expressly stated, that such exclusive right of use is not confined to the more *general* exhortations of Scripture, but extends equally to the *special*, or those which bear on the elect alone. But the gifted author of these opinions does not even stop here: for he plainly gives us to understand, that inasmuch as the exhortations, invitations, calls, et cætera, both general and special, are exclusively for the Spirit's use, so likewise for exclusive use of the Holy Spirit are "*the promises, doctrines, and so on.*" Now if you place side by side, all general exhortations which extend to the mass, all special exhortations which bear strictly on the elect, and all "*the promises, doctrines, and so on,*" then it is clear, that that will include all truth which in connexion with fallen man has been vouchsafed. The sum of the matter therefore is, that truth, *even* ALL TRUTH WHICH FOR THE SALVATION OF THE SOUL HAS EVER FROM ON HIGH BEEN REVEALED, *stands sealed up in the Holy Scriptures, ENTIRELY AND EXCLUSIVELY, for application by the Spirit of God.*

Should any reader who is a member of the P. R. Baptist

Churches be inclined to consider the position by Mr. Philpot chosen extravagant, and feel constrained to regret it—should he secretly wish that the learned gentleman had stopped short of this extreme length, and confined his assertions regarding the Spirit's exclusive right of use simply to the general exhortations—then, before going farther, let him hear the reason for this procedure on the part of his illustrious leader. This sagacious teacher was intellectually clear enough to see at a glance, that to affirm *that GENERAL TRUTHS were lodged in the Bible exclusively FOR THE SPIRIT'S USE, but SPECIAL AND PARTICULAR TRUTHS for the use OF MAN* (that is, ministers), would have been an allegation so monstrous as to be altogether fatal to his theory. But not only this, for to have admitted that any truth within the boards of the Bible was in any conceivable sense placed there for ministerial use, would have brought before the minds of his constituents that which it was vital to the success of his theory to hold excluded, to wit, the grand ordinance of PUBLIC PREACHING. Half measures therefore in bolstering up that antisciptural practice which at every risk he had determined to maintain, were altogether out of the question. If this theory was to find acceptance with the members, and assume permanent place in the code of the P. R. Baptist Churches, such results could only be hoped through adopting a very extreme course; going the whole length to which our illustrious author has gone. Hence the proposition entire as it stands, to wit, "*that general truth, special truth, all truth whatever, has by Jehovah been lodged in the Bible WHOLLY AND SOLELY FOR THE SPIRIT'S USE.*"

Now this being the kind of wisdom to which, despite my order as an intelligent being I am by Mr. Philpot required to defer, I first of all insist on testing by his own theory the practice of the learned gentleman himself. If the case of the general truths, special truths, all truths of Scripture, be indeed as by Mr. Philpot represented, then, Am I not to the uttermost justified in demanding of that eminent person, "Art not thou therefore inexcusable, O man, that thus judgest? for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself; for thou that judgest doest the very same things. Behold thou art called a teacher, and art confident that thou thyself art a guide to the blind, a light to them that are in darkness. Thou therefore which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? thou that sayest Because all truth is lodged in the Bible wholly and solely for the Spirit's use, *therefore a man should not preach*, DOST THOU PREACH? Thou that sayest truth is to stand in the Bible as a sword in the scabbard until *the good pleasure of the Spirit to use it*, DOST THOU *pluck that truth as a sword out of the scabbard, and AT THINE OWN PLEASURE make use of it?* Thou

that sayest the prerogative of the Spirit claims respect, and that *thou abhorrest as sacrilege its violation*, ART THOU THE VERY FIRST THAT BY DISRESPECTING, THYSELF DOST VIOLATE IT? Thou that makest thy boast of ridiculing as error obedience to the gospel mandate, and as a solution of the difficulty in connexion with the general exhortations settest up thy self-devised theory, *through practically contradicting THY RASHLY DEvised THEORY, and effectually exploding THY PROffered SOLUTION*, dost thou, as much to thine own reason as the Lord's revealed wisdom do violence,—and leave behind in the Calvinistic Churches cause of interminable debate, strife, confusion? (Rom. ii. 1, 17.) Let the reader now behold that which I had undertaken to prove, to wit, the *cruel offending* of this third head of Mr. Philpot's theory against the life-long labour of love which not only by the learned gentleman himself, but whole band of his ministerial colleagues, has been laid down at the Redeemer's feet.

But perhaps with design to extricate this illustrious scholar from a dilemma, it is argued,—‘Yes; but Mr. Philpot did what he did in humble hope that God might see fit to own and bless his preaching, and through the influence of the Holy Spirit work comfort and sanctification in the hearts of his people.’ To this again I reply, ‘Yea; but there stands this learned gentleman's own decree, “*Truth—all truth—is lodged in the Bible wholly and solely for the Spirit's use*; and because a modern minister cannot engraft his words on the Bible, and because he cannot speak by express inspiration of God, therefore, if he venture to follow the Apostles in the use of any truth lodged in the Bible, he must do so conscious of its impotency, and may as well seek to rival Peter in working miracles as to follow him in the preaching of God's word.” Now such being the rule of judgment—such the decree by this illustrious man established—to that rule I am bound to hold both himself, and the whole band of his ministerial brethren. As far as the blessing of Jehovah on public preaching is concerned, whether for the sanctification of saints or the conversion of sinners, it is altogether lost sight of: might I not in strict equity say, is with purpose expressly ignored? A dry, hard, antisciptural rule is set up; of which the exclusive object is, to vilify and reproach those who defer to divine sanction and precedent. Well, be it so: gratuitous and unscriptural though that rule be, let it stand. **THE RULE, THEREFORE, IS THE RULE.** Mr. Philpot takes leave to apply it to those, for whose reproach it was expressly devised,—those who in accordance with the mandate of Jehovah preach the gospel to the unregenerate. And by this hard, dry, antisciptural rule, he brands them as errorists, opponents of truth, imbeciles. *Well, the rule is the rule: heed not the*

sacrifice : it must stand. I therefore as the IRON ROD of God—the instrument to apply their own judgment to the judges—take the hard, dry, unscriptural rule of their adoption, and by sanction, wisdom, and authority thereof, *that very sanction, wisdom, and authority by which they have condemned* THE INNOCENT, convict Mr. Philpot himself, and all his ministerial coadjutors of a precisely similar act. As a consequence, I am in equity constrained to bring them one and all under the same condemnation ; on their own warrant publish them as errorists, opponents of truth, and imbeciles. *Well, the rule is the rule : heed not the sacrifice : it must stand.* And thus, by the very rule of their own devising and adoption, are taken as in a net of steel the entire band of brethren, who, relying upon the vain deductions of natural reason, have in the ordinance of the public ministry, seen fit TO DEPART FROM THE JUDGMENT OF JEHOVAH.

But here probably, as a last resource, it is by the admirers of this distinguished man urged, ‘ Well setting aside the said rule as unscriptural—admitting it to be altogether absurd—yet Mr. Philpot in preaching to regenerate parties, parties under spiritual guidance and training, might reasonably hope that the Lord through the Spirit should bless his labours : hence, in the actual work of the ministry he was not in reality condemnable, though certainly by the antisciptural rule of his own devising, laying himself open to ridicule for unjust condemnation of himself.’ If at length on behalf of this excellent man it be thus ingenuously pleaded, then, cordially—from the depths of my soul—I reply, Right, Granted, Indisputable. But now, having cheerfully conceded thus much, I too will demand at the whole band of Mr. Philpot’s brethren a question. Let them answer it, as those who *perforce* shall ere long answer at the bar of God. This then is my question : ‘ If notwithstanding *his* disregard of one part of Jehovah’s revealed will, Mr. Philpot might, while following the Apostles in the grand work of preaching the gospel to saints, reasonably expect the divine blessing to rest upon his labours, on what ground might he thus expect it ? Now give me what answer you will, so that it be only scriptural, I am satisfied. Do you say, ‘ Because God has commanded it ’ ? Well, I agree. Or ‘ Because God works by instrumentality ’ ? Again, I am content. Or do you say, ‘ Because from the beginning His intention was to make His word spirit and life to His people ’ ? Here also I am with you, heart and soul : in either—in all. The simple fact is, that all these reasons, whether considered apart or together, are true. But if it be so with regard to the ministration of the gospel to saints, then, since God has equally commanded the preaching of the gospel to sinners—since also in that work, the

Son of God Himself nobly set the example—and since by inspiration of the Spirit the Apostles persevered unto death in that practice—Why, I ask, in the faithful following of this express mandate of the Father, this open example of the Son, and this continual practice of the Apostles, should not God *equally* bless the labours of the very men at whom Mr. Philpot so uncharitably sneers? And why in their faithful ministration of the gospel to sinners *should the Lord not through the Spirit graciously seal His truth unto conversion?* Let this be shewn, and it will in some slight degree serve to lighten the weight of that reproach, which now necessarily cleaves to Mr. Philpot's highly antiscriptural theory.

The sixth exception to this particular head of the theory which I feel under absolute necessity to take, is because of a further disastrous consequence in connection with it: and is this. That by representing the divine command, "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature," to be ABSOLUTELY USELESS, not only does it virtually assert that in His issue of that command JEHOVAH HAS STULTIFIED HIMSELF; but, as an infallible consequence, has before the angels in light ANNIHILATED HIS CLAIM TO ESSENTIAL PERFECTION.

In considering this dreadful imputation, let the reader be pleased to observe, that the command "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature," presupposes on the part of God *design*. Remove the idea of design, and there remains but an act of insanity. But if the fact of design be conceded, then, that design as from the very terms of the mandate itself unmistakable, is, through the channel of the outward ear, and by instrumentality of the living voice, to instruct the minds of the ignorant, first, with regard to their need of Jehovah's mercy, and secondly, the particular way of that mercy through the sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ. If this were *not* the design, then, since the commandment positively inculcates the preaching to the nations of the gospel, or GLAD-TIDINGS, but one conclusion would remain, to wit,¹ that with deliberate intent to deceive, the commandment had brought into being the whole substance of a lie. If therefore it be granted, that God cannot deny Himself, but continues everlastingly holy, it is evident, first, that in issuing the gospel mandate to preach to the world and to every creature GLAD-TIDINGS, God positively intended what He said; intended that the benignant proffer of salvation should be preached through the sacrifice of His Son; intended that forgiveness of sin should, through the righteousness and precious blood of Christ, be freely, universally proclaimed. But that particular head of the theory upon which I am at present engaged, represents the gospel command, "Go ye into all the world and preach the

THE ARGUMENT AGAINST THE SOVEREIGN

to every creature,* to have no real design, no sense nor
ng whatever; but that the reality of the case is, that all
be its nature whatever it may—general exhortations, par-
r exhortations, doctrines, promises, and so on—are lodged
ie Bible *not* for declaration to the nations and to every crea-
, but there as a sword in the scabbard to stand WHOLLY
D SOLELY FOR THE SPIRIT'S USE, who at His good
asure is to make use of them on the elect. Now if this theory
re true, then, since the real will of God with regard to all the
ths of the Bible is, that they stand there *not* for any min-
erial purpose, *not* to be declared to the world nor to every
eature, but WHOLLY AND SOLELY FOR THE SPIRIT'S USE, then,
1 issuing the command "Go ye into all the world and preach
he gospel to every creature," *the substance of which is NOT HIS
WILL—a command, in short, the substance of which is EXACTLY CON-
TRARY TO HIS WILL—command which imperatively lays obligation
on His children to act IN OPPOSITION TO HIS WILL*, the conclusion
becomes inevitable, that Jehovah, the august Majesty laying
claim to possession of wisdom infinite and inscrutable, has openly
STULTIFIED HIMSELF.

Here then at length, according to the theory of the eminent
Mr. Philpot, have we THE PREMEDITATIONS OF ETERNAL WISDOM
AT DIRECT ANTAGONISM WITH THE PREMEDITATIONS OF
ETERNAL WISDOM. Jehovah, despite possession of an omni-
science through the all-comprehending light of which it *ought* to
have been impossible to err, actually contradicting and confound-
ing Himself: THE ALMIGHTY GOD STULTIFYING THE
ALMIGHTY.

But, alas for the Divine Majesty! the evil does not even here
terminate: a conclusion follows, and is irresistible: let the reader
mark it. To wit, that if according to this particular head of the
theory, *the wisdom of God in the economy of grace does actually
militate against the wisdom of God in the gospel command*, then,
since such wisdom cannot possibly be sound, it must of necessity
be held to be faulty. But forasmuch as possession of a wisdom
which is faulty is now proved against God, that fact has for its
consequence to establish the possessor in one attribute at least—
this attribute of wisdom—altogether defective. And since the
fact is indisputable, that defectiveness in an attribute dissipates
in the case of the party to whom such defectiveness may be
traced all claim to essential perfection, therefore, that defectiveness
in the grand attribute of wisdom which is by human theory
now proved against God, must, if such theory be worth a straw,
effectually annihilate the claim of the Divine Being to essential
perfection. Thus to the extent of that defectiveness which has

by the theory been ascribed to it, *is the very essence of the Godhead shorn of its glory—made to come short of moral perfection*: in plain phrase, **THE INFINITELY EXALTED NATURE OF JEHOVAH IS DEGRADED—GIVEN OVER TO EVERLASTING CONTEMPT.**

But how long shall I dwell upon this lamentable theme? Truly there need be no end: for its refutation, were I disposed to enlarge upon it, might be extended to any conceivable length. One more weighty objection in terms concise as may be I shall add, and therewith close this portion of my animadversions.

The seventh exception then to this particular head of the theory which I feel under absolute necessity to take, is equally serious as the foregoing, and is this. That by the egregious error which with respect to the prerogative of the Spirit it embodies, to wit, that the right to make use of divine truth is exclusively His, *it CONDEMNS the very existence and presence on earth of the Bible: proclaiming, as with the tongue of a trumpet, THE REVELATION OF THE WRITTEN WORD TO BE A STUPENDOUS BLUNDER.*

To make my remarks on this head as concise as possible, I propose the question,—Is the Bible nothing more than an elaborate monument to mark on the part of God a prodigal expenditure of useless labour—labour altogether without purpose, or in vain? Is it, in short, nothing more than a swift witness on earth against the wisdom and the foresight of its august, its most venerable Author? At the very sound of this question every tender conscience will doubtless start—every sanctified spirit stand aghast. Yet this is *that*, which by head third of the unadvised theory which I am examining, is substantially asserted. Once more, to the proof. Let me consummate this refutation of human wisdom—wisdom unparalleled, it may be, for the extent and character of its offending—by one more impregnable demonstration, and with that close.

I say then, and the assertion is indisputable, that for the great, the omniscient, the infinitely glorious God, throughout a period of four thousand one hundred years* studiously to plan and execute, *that that might have existence which was in the end to be of no real utility—was to accomplish nought—must by every reflecting party be admitted to be an egregious blunder; a procedure altogether derogatory to His infinite wisdom, subversive of His intellectual grandeur and glory.* Observe then, that beyond even His own power to alter it, God *has* throughout the enormous period named both planned and executed—*has* inspired and sent forth prophets, “rising up early and sending”—that the Bible *might* have existence; that we *might* have the privilege of its presence in our midst. All this on the part of Jehovah. Turn now the eye of the mind from God, and let it fall upon the theory of

* From the transgression in Eden to the close of the canon of Scripture by the Book of Revelation.

the accomplished Mr. Philpot; fix it firmly upon that particular head with which I am now dealing. Does the talented gentleman not very plainly lay it down, that "exhortations both general and special, together with all promises, doctrines, et cætera, are lodged in the Scriptures as in a divine armoury, there as a sword in the scabbard to stand *wholly and solely for the Spirit's use, who, as He sees fit, is to employ them to divide between soul and spirit, joints and marrow.*" (pp. 81, 82.) Thus much on the part of the excellent Mr. Philpot. But I venture to inquire, what is in reality meant when it is said, that the Holy Spirit applies truth, and thereby divides between soul and spirit, joints and marrow? The answer to this inquiry is as follows: *By A DIRECT, A PERSONAL ACT, the Holy Spirit, whether for enlightening, for softening, or for subduing, SEALS such portions of truth as to Himself seem fit, WITH DIVINE POWER UPON THE SOUL; thus bringing to pass in the subject of His gracious operation, SUCH DISPOSITIONAL STATE AS IN HIS WISDOM HE HIMSELF VOUCHSAFES TO CHOOSE.* Then the Holy Spirit's use of the said truths, is by an operation altogether mysterious, secret, and supernatural; that is, by an effectual forth-putting of His divine power *within, or upon the soul.* But such operation, it may at a glance be seen, must necessarily be **QUITE APART FROM THE LETTER-PRESS OF THE BIBLE**; that is, without the Holy Spirit taking up the printed Word, opening, and preaching from it. Indeed, the high work of the Spirit stands forth in contradistinction to that mere physical act of the earthly preacher, being *through the secret, invisible, mysterious action of His almighty breath upon the heart.* That this is the idea, is everywhere freely granted; the thing, moreover, is too experimentally witnessed to be disproved or denied. But I answer, that as far as this inward, secret, supernatural work is concerned, it is evident that the Holy Spirit can execute it quite as well without the printed Bible being in the world, as with. If therefore the divine purpose to instruct the intellect of the ignorant through the outward ear be lost sight of—in other words, if the physical act of preaching be excluded—in other words still, if the truths of inspiration are lodged in the Bible not for ministerial purposes, but wholly and solely for the purpose of the Spirit—then, since the Spirit does not for His occasions make use of typography, nor of organic voice, but quite apart from physical things, works by His enlightening and renewing power upon the heart, nothing can be clearer than the fact, that through the existence and presence in our midst of that divine book called "**THE BIBLE,**" we have at the hand of Jehovah four thousand one hundred years of inspiring, prophesying, and recording, absolutely to no purpose. For after all it abides a fact, that the Holy Spirit

works QUITE APART FROM THE MERE TYPOGRAPHY OF THE BOOK, and by direct action upon the heart.

But here it will doubtless be pleaded, "Nay; for God has chosen to work by instrumentalities, and will not work apart from them; moreover, in carrying out through the Spirit His sovereign purposes, the Holy Bible is the grand instrument of His choice; and since, in an instrumental point of view, the Bible *is* necessary upon earth, it is clear that in revealing it Jehovah has not stultified Himself." To the plea itself I have nothing whatever to object; indeed, the facts which it embodies, are precisely those for which I so strenuously contend. It is the theory of Mr. Philpot, and that alone, which in its third head makes utterly void the instrumental use of the Bible. For as at the outset of this chapter I said, in tones far too consequential, and with air greatly too lofty, it suggests as a righteous proposition the fallacy, that truth, all truth, has been lodged in the Bible NOT FOR INSTRUMENTAL USE, but entirely and exclusively for application by the Spirit of God. Its instrumental use therefore by any uninspired man, shall be held to constitute an offence as irreverent and absurd as the attempt, unauthorized, to work miracles. Here then are all uninspired men, even Mr. Philpot himself, absolutely cut off from the instrumental use of the Bible. But if all men, Mr. Philpot included, may not as an instrument make use of the Bible, then, to them at least, the Bible is as an instrument altogether useless. And again, if as I have already clearly shown, the Holy Spirit does not take down the written Word from the shelf, open, and from the truths therein recorded publicly preach, *but works* QUITE APART FROM TYPOGRAPHY, *works by* DIVINE AND SECRET ACTION *upon the heart*, then nothing can be more evident than the fact, that He can do that just as well, just as easily without a printed Bible being in the world as with. Hence to Him also, in an instrumental point of view, the typographical Bible is altogether and utterly useless. In spite therefore of the plea entered, here according to head third of that theory which in justification of an antisciptural practice has by Mr. Philpot been advanced, we still have four thousand one hundred years of divine inspiring, prophesying, and recording, absolutely to no purpose: THE VERY BIBLE ITSELF BECOMING AS A SWIFT WITNESS AGAINST THE GLORY AND WISDOM OF ITS DIVINE AUTHOR.

I have now submitted some of the more palpable objections, which in connection with the third, or *grand head* of Mr. Philpot's theory, seem to thrust themselves upon the mind. Not in this last only, but its first and second heads also, I trust that I have very effectually subverted that strange hypothesis. I pretend

neither to have exhausted the subject, nor in any degree commensurate with its demerit condemned the fallacy reviewed. But though in deference to the divine will, seven only out of the twelve original exceptions taken to it have been given, I still trust that enough has been placed on record, to seal for ever in the judgment of the least intelligent reader, the radical rottenness of that reasoning by which, the practice of not ministering the gospel as by God commanded is upheld. Reasoning which, as my mind apprehends it, would seem to have but one real object, viz., to divert the attention of the inquirer from the true, the sole point at issue, and to the very uttermost obstruct just and scriptural investigation. Small measure of which must infallibly suffice to strip from a most unrighteous system its veil, and make its rank rationalistic pretension too manifest to be by the spiritual mind for a moment tolerated.

CHAPTER III.

THAT INCOMPREHENSIBLE STANDARD WHICH AS A TEST OF MINISTERIAL SOUNDNESS IN THE TRUTH HAS ON THE STRENGTH OF THE FOREGOING TEACHING AND THEORY BEEN SET UP, EXAMINED AND MOST RIGHTEOUSLY REJECTED.

THE antiscryptural teaching which I have felt it incumbent upon me to impugn, and the equally unscriptural theory by which it is unavailingly backed, having now been carefully analyzed, it will I trust by every ingenuous mind be admitted, that in unmasking and condemning both, I have but executed an imperative duty. But in referring to the "Review" from which this objectionable teaching and theory are cited, I have, I am concerned to say, found other strange things; things which, if the precious consciousness of integrity toward God and divine truth is to be retained, I am at liberty neither to veil, ignore, nor spare.

Of these passing strange things, that which more immediately stands related to the errors now exploded is,—The inexplicable ground on which alone the accomplished Mr. Philpot will vouchsafe any messenger of the gospel the honourable distinction of being—OF THE TRUTH; or, as the conventional phrase hath it—"A MAN OF TRUTH." The judgment now to be tested is so altogether singular—so manifestly more deeply insulting to God than even the antiscryptural practice against which these demonstrations are directed—that I have deemed it essential to the best interests of the P. R. Baptist Churches, thoroughly and radically to sift it. Should the examination serve to shed a still

stronger light upon the tendency of the errors already handled, my labour in these few additional pages will not I shall feel have been vain.

That in this instance also I may do full justice, I here transcribe entire that particular passage, which with a view to relieve the truth and glory of God from most unhallowed imputation, it will at the bar of common sense, equity, Scripture, be my high duty uncompromisingly to arraign.

Having admitted, first, that the Scriptures are full of general exhortations to the unregenerate; secondly, that these are as much a part of God's word as the doctrines of free grace; and thirdly, that they stand on the pages of the Bible in spite of the utter aversion of many Calvinists to their presence; this illustrious man with all calmness and premeditation proceeds to deliver himself as follows.

THE PASSING STRANGE STATEMENT.

"With respect to these (general) passages we believe that the minds of many, and especially, perhaps, of ministers of truth, have passed through three stages. In the first stage, these general passages weighed so heavily in the scale that they preponderated over the doctrines of grace. Arminianism made Calvinism kick the beam. In the second stage, when the glorious doctrines of grace were first brought home with sweetness and power to the soul, *there ensued A PAINFUL STRUGGLE between the head and the heart*; the latter feeding with eagerness on, and cleaving with all the warmth of new-born affection to the precious truths of salvation, and the former halting and wavering in the letter of the word, *unable to cast aside these general exhortations*, and yet unable to reconcile them with spiritual experience. Here the scales were brought to be a little more even, but still fluctuating up and down with painful perplexity. And then ensued the third stage, **IN WHICH MOST IF NOT ALL MEN OF TRUTH ARE**, when increasing helplessness, and increasing light upon and life out of the glorious truths of salvation, *made them throw overboard, AS SO MUCH ARMINIAN LUMBER, all general invitations and exhortations*, and cleave wholly and solely to the doctrines of grace, and the experience so intimately and inseparably connected with them. The soul is brought to this point of rest, that all its salvation, and all the salvation of the Church flow from and centre in the doctrines of grace, and that therefore *everything must be unceremoniously rejected which in the slightest degree CONTRADICTS OR TRENCHES ON these glorious truths*. And the experience of the soul, in darkness as well as in light, in its sinkings as much as in its risings, is so closely and intimately dove-tailed in with the truth of the doctrines

of grace that it must abide by them at any rate, living and dying, in time and through eternity." (p. 53.)

I have recorded this statement complete, that the learned author might have the advantage of a full and satisfactory hearing. With regard to its substance, I candidly confess, that of the two objectionable things which in a truly pre-eminent degree characterize it, I am at a loss to know which astonishes me most, THE PRESUMPTION SO BOLDLY DECLARED—OR THE IGNORANCE SO PALPABLY MANIFESTED.

First then, the PRESUMPTION so boldly declared : let the reader of his courtesy suffer me to set it in a clear light. This accomplished man here professes to show, the several stages by which the minds of those whom alone *he* deems "men of truth," attain that exalted eminence from which, to the exclusion of all spirits less irreverently bold, they only in solitary grandeur look down. It was by passing through three distinct grades of feeling—stages of experience—states of mind. In the first, the many general exhortations, calls, invitations, with which the Scriptures throughout, but especially the discourses of Christ and His Apostles abound, were not merely entertained with respect, but unduly exalted ; that is, were held to the exclusion, or handled at the expense of the doctrines of grace. The men thus abusing them therefore were Arminians, consequently not *men of truth*. With this passage, I have no particular cause of quarrel ; for unquestionably, in the full sense of that term, the Arminian is *not* a man of truth, seeing that he rejects certain of the sublimest of the doctrines of Jehovah's word. In the second stage, the parties in question have by the Spirit of God been brought to handle and taste the power of the doctrines of grace : and now, according to the assumption of Mr. Philpot, they occupy a position in which it is no longer possible to respect the more general portions of Jehovah's word. Hence, as he affirms, they became involved in *a painful struggle between the head and heart* : their heart loving and feeding with sweetness on the doctrines of grace, their head, because of the bold and prominent manner in which these general exhortations stand forth on the page of Scripture, still through praiseworthy reverence for God unable either to cast them aside, or reconcile with *their own* spiritual experience.* This assumption, I need hardly say, is altogether gratuitous ; disproved by

* It is evident from this passage that Mr. Philpot would make his own experience to be judge over God's word. This was the grand *mistake* of the learned gentleman's whole life. Here also he betrays a perfectly startling measure of mental confusion : for what, be it asked, *has* GRACIOUS *saintly* experience to do with Jehovah's verbal summons to UNGRACIOUS, *that is, worldly and unregenerate parties* ?

the lives and labours of those greatest of Calvinistic divines—the theologians of the Orthodox Churches of the Reformation; all of whom, while themselves in the experience of the saving power of the doctrines of grace, freely and earnestly preached the gospel of the grace of God to the unregenerate. Regardless of that fact however—fact utterly subversive of his whole indecorous statement with regard to “men of truth”—this highly gifted gentleman again proceeds to pronounce judgment: it is this, “The scales are now brought to be a little more even, but still fluctuating up and down with painful perplexity.” That is, the ministers in question have now approached much nearer to that mental state, by possession of which Mr. Philpot will vouchsafe to admit their claim to the honour of crowning as “MEN OF TRUTH.” Howbeit they are not yet eligible—no, not by a mighty hand—to be graced with the chaplet. It is still absolutely necessary to attain to another stage—the third. In the third stage we are given to understand, that under increasing helplessness, increasing light upon and life out of the glorious truths of salvation, the parties in question grow irreverently bold,—cease to preserve even common respect for the general exhortations,—treat the wisdom, will, and sovereign right of God inextricably involved in these passages with contempt,—conclude upon intellectual light as immeasurably in advance of the light of revelation,—and falsely branding the said undoubted portions of the Bible with the opprobrious term “ARMINIAN LUMBER,” cast them recklessly overboard. “Cleaving,” says Mr. Philpot, “wholly and solely” (*that is, to the exclusion of all else in the Bible—that is, in determined one-sidedness*) “to the doctrines of grace.”

And now that they have become thus bold,—thus unpietying toward a great part of the eternal Word,—thus confessedly, thus deplorably one-sided,—thus despisers of the uncomprehended depths of Jehovah's purpose in the general exhortations,—thus professed opponents of the wisdom, will, and sovereign right of God in connexion with the non-elect,—thus exalters of the rationalistic spark in opposition to the light of the omniscience of Deity,—I say, now that the said parties have at length presumed all this, Mr. Philpot once more brings forth his verdict; and this time, strange to say, the verdict is in their favour. Mr. Philpot will now vouchsafe to pronounce them worthy of crowning—“*men of truth*,” full-blown: for saith he, (I subjoin his own words), “IN THIS THIRD STAGE MOST IF NOT ALL MEN OF TRUTH ARE”!!!

According to this reasoning therefore, a minister who commences his career *not* as a MAN OF TRUTH, never can rise to that enviable distinction until by some or other means he has become

bold enough, untender enough, irreverent enough, one-sided enough, rationalistic enough, to repudiate the example of the Son of God—that also of all the inspired Apostles—contravene to the extent of his power in one grand head, that divine purpose to watch the development of which is the glory of the archangel—and with undisguised contempt of great part of the revealed Word (that Word representative of the infinite wisdom of Deity), cast it out as “ARMINIAN LUMBER.” If this be not contradiction in terms—enthroning by the way of dethroning—crowning by the way of discrowning—I shall be exceedingly gratified to be informed what it is. Yet to logic vile as THIS, on pain of being accounted errorists, are we by publication and republication of these decrees virtually called: the alternative alone left us being, that in default, we be permanently branded as Arminians.

But to make his matter more inconsistent, more open to suspicion still, it is not by Mr. Philpot even concealed, that, (exactly as I have affirmed), this third stage of experience or feeling (attainment to which alone qualifies to rank as a *man of truth*) is only to be reached by the unreserved sacrifice—the entire surrender—of a very large portion that blessed tenderness of conscience toward the Word of God, with which the party concerned might originally have set out. For in a passage immediately succeeding the very extraordinary judgment which I have now been considering, it is said, “We do not then consider this (that is the question of the general exhortations) a dry doctrinal discussion, a dispute of words, a barren useless controversy, but one full of interest to those who have been painfully perplexed, AND THAT IN PROPORTION TO THE TENDERNESS OF THEIR CONSCIENCE TOWARD GOD’S WORD.” (p. 53.) When therefore this original tenderness of conscience toward the more general part of God’s word has been dissipated, and when instead of it a bold, hard, contemptuous spirit has been engendered, then, strange to say the result is, that this unenviable exchange of conscience toward the Word for contempt, does, according to the strictest rule of orthodoxy as orthodoxy is judged by Mr. Philpot, fully entitle the hard-hearted party to the high, the enviable distinction of crowning, as—“A MAN OF TRUTH.” Such the incredible, nay! the altogether incomprehensible reasoning of Mr. Philpot in honour of them, whose established practice it is, NOT TO MINISTER THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST AS BY GOD COMMANDED. I can no more suppose that the great and good man recording these sentiments could, even under the thickest, the most blinding veil of rationalistic prejudice believe his own words, than I could imagine darkness to be light—truth falsehood—or the God of glory unholy.

Thus much for the PRESUMPTION declared: but now, a brief

word on the IGNORANCE so palpably manifested. It is seen at a glance, in that extraordinary opinion which this eminent man takes no pains to conceal—which he openly expresses—nay! upon the assumed acuteness of which he evidently values himself—to wit, that the general exhortations so frequent in the Word, but especially in the public preaching of the Son of God and His Apostles, *do actually CONTRADICT and TRENCH ON the glorious doctrines of grace.* For this offence, the learned gentleman places them under his special ban—stigmatizes as “Arminian lumber”—and with this deep, unmerited reproach full upon them, casts overboard. Listen to the deliberate statement, as with authority scarcely less than imperial it comes flowing from Mr. Philpot’s pen. In the following passage, through utter lack of scriptural evidence and argument, even thus, most unhappily, dogmatizes this distinguished writer:—“The soul is brought to this point of rest, that all its salvation, and all the salvation of the Church, flow from and centre in the doctrines of grace, and therefore *everything must be unceremoniously REJECTED which in the slightest degree CONTRADICTS OR TRENCHES ON THESE GLORIOUS TRUTHS.*” From the concluding portion of this passage, as much also the unmerited doom to which this illustrious man (to use his own word) “*unceremoniously*” consigns the more general exhortations of Jehovah’s word, it may fairly be gathered how much he regards those exhortations *as offending against the doctrines of grace.* So deeply indeed does he consider them to offend, that he maintains it to be essential to the character of a MAN OF TRUTH that they be discarded—cast overboard—doomed to perish. Nor this only, but decrees, that until with high hand they *are* by a man thus recklessly treated, *are* thus ruthlessly, thus pitilessly sacrificed, the tender-hearted party sparing and retaining them, shall be deemed guilty of offence sufficient altogether to exclude from the distinction of crowning as a “MAN OF TRUTH:” nay, worse! shall be held up to public scorn, as an errorist, maniac, or fool. Could anything more decisively than this judgment show, how entirely in framing his opinions Mr. Philpot relies on the deductions of his OWN REASON. For what is the imperishable FACT? This. That it is utterly impossible that Jehovah’s infallible Word should *contradict* itself; or that any one part of that Word should *trench upon* any other. Relying upon blind rationalistic surmise, however, Mr. Philpot altogether misses this self-evident FACT: hence without ruth or ceremony rejects as contradictory of the doctrines of grace, all the more general portions of Scripture.

Let it now for a single moment be supposed, that this eminent individual is right—grant that the general exhortations of the

Word *do* actually, *do* most unworthily, contradict and trench on the doctrines of grace—I say, grant all that by this renowned man is so gratuitously predicated—and *what in the face of it are we to think of the infinite wisdom of the inspiring Agent, the Spirit of the Living God, the Holy Ghost?* The doctrines of grace, are certainly a precious *portion* of the Written Word: consequently, were delivered by inspiration of the Spirit. And the general exhortations, are *as* certainly another precious *portion* of the same Word; “as much,” says Mr. Philpot, “the Word of God as the doctrines of grace;” consequently, were also delivered by inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Here then, according to those particular opinions of the Rev. gentleman which I am sifting, are certain doctrines of grace delivered by inspiration of the Spirit of God, directly *contradicting and clashing with* certain general exhortations also delivered by inspiration of the Divine Spirit. And contrariwise, general exhortations by the Spirit, *contradicting and trenching on* doctrines of grace from the very same Spirit! Now, what, under these circumstances, are we to think of the infinite wisdom of the Holy Ghost, He who in the economy of grace covenanted with the Father and Son, to frame for the use and guidance of the children of men that Book which should be infallible—the Holy Bible? If the strange judgment of the erudite Mr. Philpot is to stand, then, there is nothing left us but to conclude, that the heretofore universally received opinion with respect to the absolute perfection of the divine wisdom, is exploded; and that that wisdom is now to be considered fallible: a wisdom capable of misapprehension—liable to failure—in short, akin to that which characterizes the children of men.

But if this conclusion be such, that except under positive aberration its retention by the mind of man is impossible, then, it must necessarily by every impartial examiner be admitted, that in the judgment by this learned gentleman delivered, the learned gentleman has to no inconsiderable extent erred: has, contrary to his wonted clearness and penetration, shown a singularly strange lack of spiritual discernment. For the assertion that Jehovah stultifies Himself, is manifestly as much a contradiction in terms, as that truth is falsehood, or light darkness. For to stultify one's self is folly—egregious folly—folly altogether befitting the maniac or fool. But God, is wisdom; and the Holy Ghost, is God; hence, the Holy Ghost is wisdom; and if so, then, that divine wisdom can by no possibility become folly; I say, can no more become folly, than truth can become falsehood, or light darkness. But if the Holy Spirit be as I have shown *wisdom*, and that divine wisdom be by very nature incapable of becoming folly, then, since *the act of self-stultification is not wisdom*, but contrariwise, intense

folly, it is evident, that such act can have no connexion with the Holy Ghost. On the strength of these reasonings therefore I am absolutely bound—ay ! with as little ruth and ceremony as our distinguished author himself vouchsafes the general exhortations—to *cast out as blind rationalistic deduction the conclusion*, THAT DIVINE TRUTH CONTRADICTS AND TRENCHES ON DIVINE TRUTH.

But should it now be admitted, that on this head at least the learned gentleman has come short of the true light,—if in opposition to the misconception here made manifest it be conceded, that through possession of an infinite wisdom the Holy Spirit cannot by self-contradiction stultify Himself,—then, that being granted, in contradistinction to the judgment of Mr. Philpot I on behalf of the general exhortations assume leave to lay down as follows. That since they do *not* as by the talented gentleman too ignorantly supposed, contradict or subvert the glorious doctrines of grace—do *not* as by him rashly asserted either clash with or trench on those doctrines—therefore, according to the righteous judgment of Jehovah, according also to that of every reflecting being by the power of prejudice not blinded, it is absolutely certain, that those august portions of Holy Writ ought *not* to be consigned to that doom to which (wrongly deeming meet) this great man has so unceremoniously decreed them. In plain phrase, these divinely revealed general exhortations ought *not* to be ignored and disrespected ; ought *not* to be slanderously treated and maligned ; ought *not* as “Arminian lumber” to be ignominiously branded, tossed overboard, done to death and buried in the sea of oblivion : YEA ! AND AGAIN I SAY—OUGHT NOT.

But if notwithstanding all that has been said,—if despite truth, right, justice, fealty, prejudiced parties should still persist in demanding that these *unoffending* general exhortations be sacrificed,—if after the ancient model they insist on releasing the Barabbas of rationalistic deduction and crucifying the Holy One of inspiration,—then, taking up the very pertinent words of the Roman Governor, I reply, “Ye have brought these general exhortations unto me as things which contradict and trench on your doctrines of divine grace, and behold, I, having examined them before you, have found no fault in these general exhortations touching those things whereof ye accuse them : no, nor yet the astute Mr. Philpot ; for I referred you to him—even to his writings ; and lo, nothing worthy of death by throwing overboard is done by them. *Wherefore then should you crucify them ? Why ? WHAT EVIL HAVE THEY DONE ? I WILL THEREFORE RELEASE THEM AND LET THEM GO.*”

Having now rescued Jehovah's general exhortations, as revealed by the Holy Spirit, from the groundless charge of contradicting

and trenching on Jehovah's doctrines of grace, as delivered by the same Spirit, there falls to me at this point an imperative duty: duty from which, as a faithful servant of Christ, there is no possibility of escape. To wit, as in the person of Jehovah to disapprove, yea! in manner the most absolute condemn, both the spirit and act of presuming in presence of the Churches of Christ to brand the infinitely glorious word of God *with the opprobrious—the manifestly false term*—ARMINIAN LUMBER. If irreverence such as this, is in the high places of the Church—the very ministry—to be tolerated, what, as a result of such example, may we not expect in places more obscure? With a view therefore to demonstrate the grave nature of that offence, with which by this intensely indecorous act Mr. Philpot has rendered himself chargeable, I submit as follows.

The Church of the Lord Jesus Christ is an institution set up, preserved on earth, and sanctified unto future glory, by that most august of all instrumentalities—TRUTH. It was therefore of the utmost moment, that the Record which for sanctification and salvation was in the name of God to be delivered Her, should throughout—or in each particular head of its entire teaching—be in strict accordance *with the above principle*. That it might be so, the third divine Person in the ever-blessed Trinity, the Holy Ghost, did Himself covenant with the Father and the Son, *in strict conformity with the eternal principle in question to frame SUCH a Volume*, as should be entirely adapted to the carrying out of those ends which had by Jehovah been everlastingly decreed. According to this divine covenanting from eternity, so of His faithfulness has He in time performed: having by the splendid prediction of the Book of Revelation, finally and for ever sealed up the vision and prophecy. *The Bible therefore both is, and is by the redeemed Church to be held, A PERFECT BOOK; a book in which, for the safe guidance of the children of God, IS NO LACK OF THE LIGHT OF THAT WISDOM WHICH IS INFALLIBLE.* That is, whether considered with regard to the edification and sanctification of an individual in particular—or with respect to the instruction and guidance of the Church in general—there is no lack of that truth which makes manifest; and is light. But if so, then, with reference to those indiscriminate exhortations to the masses, which as a momentous part of divine truth have by the Spirit of God been revealed, be it said, that despite the false light in which our naturally rationalistic hearts may be inclined to regard them, they stand in the Word under guarantee not only of the infinite, the all-comprehending wisdom of the Spirit, but His covenanted faithfulness also: consequently, are to the uttermost worthy of honour—entitled in the very highest to respect. Entitled, I

insist, as *having proceeded forth and come from God*, to as much veneration and respect as the doctrines of grace, or any other portion of the same inspired Word. Does the eminent Mr. Philpot recognize this? does he under such profound reverence as is at the heart of the redeemed creature to the Bible due, order his dealings with the Sacred Volume? To speak more particularly, Does he in its GENERAL TRUTHS vouchsafe the Book even ordinary courtesy? Nay! in those *undoubtedly divine portions* of its awfully solemn sanctions, does he even see fit, unbranded by the stigma of his reproach, to suffer the eternal wisdom of his Maker to stand? Listen; the record runs thus: "Most if not all men of truth", (the learned gentleman himself of course being chief), "*throw overboard AS SO MUCH ARMINIAN LUMBER all Jehovah's general exhortations, invitations, calls, &c., and cleave wholly and solely to the doctrines of grace.*" (p. 53.)

In full view of this highly profane, this utterly disgraceful passage, I hesitate not to maintain, that the eminent writer has openly pronounced the *very FOUNTAIN OF GRACE, in person, the sovereign GOD OF ELECTION himself, to be an Arminian.* The proof is as follows. The author of the general exhortations is the Eternal Spirit: and the Eternal Spirit as the third Holy Person of the ever-blessed Trinity, is with the Father and the Son, co-equal, co-essential Deity. From His all-comprehending wisdom, or, to use a scriptural phrase, out of the abundance of His divine heart, does the intelligent Deity testify: and the root (saith the Spirit himself) of moral being is known by the fruit. If therefore the fruit of the Divine Mind (to wit, the general exhortations delivered by inspiration) be Arminian, so of a certainty is the root—the Mind itself. According therefore to the creature wisdom of Mr. Philpot, *the Lord Jehovah himself, the very Fountain, the deep Well-Spring of SOVEREIGN GRACE, is an ARMINIAN.* In connexion with Testimonies, Persons, Character, Majesty, Glory, Perfection, divine,—is this, I ask, befitting language? Is it language meet to be applied to any august and heavenly thing unveiled to man's dark apprehension in the Word—that Word, which as the representative of a wisdom, infinite, profound, inscrutable, *has in unspeakable condescension toward A FALLEN RACE been by the Spirit of truth revealed*—that Word with reference to the stability of which the Lord Jesus Christ has himself affirmed, "*Heaven and earth shall pass away, but my word shall not pass away?*" What kind of example, I ask, shall we call *this*, which at the hand of the right reverend gentleman is set before the lesser stars in Zion? If that Word which by Mr. Philpot's own admission is absolutely divine, the Word of general invitation and exhortation, may at the hand of this learned gentleman

be thus contemptuously treated—may as ARMINIAN LUMBER be unceremoniously cast out—Why on the same principle may not some other part of the same glorious Word, at the will and pleasure of *another*, and yet *another*, be with equal or even greater recklessness subjected to similar indignity? Can any censure be too strong, with which to mark the indignation of the Church of Christ toward an act thus irreverent, thus altogether insufferable? Is it at all to be wondered at that in the train of example such as this—treatment of the divine Word thus detestable—a whole host of men are to be found, many laying claim to possession of grace, and a few among them even professing to preach, who on the ground of its being in their esteem a root of counterfeit holiness, denounce as Arminian, Pharisaic, and legal, the whole body of the preceptory portions of the Bible? *forbidding in the redeemed Church the exhibition of that, exhibition of which for her health, strength, and usefulness,* HAS BY JEHOVAH BEEN IMPERATIVELY COMMANDED.

At this point for a single moment I digress, that I may to the P. R. Baptist Churches submit, not a light and trifling, but very solemn and deeply humbling question. This then is my question: “he that hath ears to hear let *him* hear.” I ask,—In thus denouncing a great part of the Holy Bible as error—debasement as Arminian—and contemptuously casting it out as unauthoritative and vile—does the act of the gifted Mr. Philpot in any respect differ from that reprehensible act underlying and supporting the kingdom of the great Head of antichrist in the eastern world—MAHOMMED; or that underlying and supporting the kingdom of the great Head of antichrist in the western world—THE POPE? I candidly confess my personal inability to detect a shadow of difference. But that the imputation involved in this assertion may be seen to be undeniable, let us with deliberation—in the purest spirit of equity—proceed to investigate.

In considering the case of the antichristian kingdoms in question—kingdoms curiously enough taking rise about the same period, and both, although equally enfeebled, existing to the present hour—Upon what *trick*, be it inquired, are the respective dominations of Mahommed and the Pope founded? I distinctly answer, First, by the deliberate contempt of their immediate Heads for such truths of the Holy Scriptures as were antagonistic to their personal designs: secondly, by their systematic vilifying of the Divine Word in all those faithful and unaccommodating passages: and thirdly, by their setting up IN THE SACRED NAME OF TRUTH, of their own unauthorized, uninspired dogmas; to wit, the Koran on the one hand, the Infallible Decrees on the other. Such the trick upon which both these antichristian

kingdoms have been established, and for upwards of 1200 years have rested. But to particularize. Because the Holy Scriptures by the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity of Jehovah—the Sonship, substitution, and one sacrifice for sin made by Christ—the bringing in of Him as the Saviour of the world and sole object of faith—utterly barred the antichristian design of Mahommed, therefore, in open contempt of the inspiration of Scripture he systematically vilified those divine doctrines, and IN THE SACRED NAME OF TRUTH set up his own lying dogmas in the Koran. In like manner, Because the Holy Scriptures by the doctrine of Christ's headship over the redeemed Church, not man's—the truth of justification free through the righteousness of Christ, not self-righteousness—the divine guarantee of mercy through faith in Christ's merit and blood, not priestly absolution—utterly barred the carnal ambition, the evil designs of the Bishops of Rome, therefore in open contempt of the inspiration of Scripture, they systematically vilified those august doctrines, AND IN THE SACRED NAME OF TRUTH set up their own lying dogmas in the (so-called) Infallible Decrees. Here then is the actual substance of that base trick, upon which for the protracted period above mentioned, the antichristian kingdoms of Mahommed and the Pope have stood. And now, with the above facts before us for guidance, let us proceed to settle that question which in connexion with the act of Mr. Philpot I have submitted. Against the day of judgment then do I solemnly aver, that in a precisely similar manner, that is, Because the Holy Scriptures by the grand doctrine of the evangelical purpose of Jehovah in the non-elect—the all-sufficiency of the Work of Christ as a righteous ground for the progress of that purpose—the imperative mandate of the gospel, the equally authoritative example and preaching of the Son of God and his inspired Apostles—have utterly barred the design of the illustrious Mr. Philpot, to wit, in the public ministration of the gospel to subvert apostolic sanction and precedent, therefore, in open contempt of the inspiration of Scripture, he has seen fit systematically (by which I mean, in spite of his own admissions that the whole portion of Scripture by himself profaned IS the Word of God) to vilify as Arminian lumber the above most august, most God-magnifying doctrines; and IN THE SACRED NAME OF TRUTH set up his own rationalistic or human decree, to wit, *that it is NOT LAWFUL for a minister of Christ in his public ministration of the gospel to preach*, AS IN THE IMPERIAL MANDATE OF THE GOSPEL BY JEHOVAH COMMANDED. Will the acutest casuist, I submit, in the dreadfully irreverent acts of the several parties in question—acts which for a record upon my soul in judgment I have here clear as sunbeam set before the P. R.

Baptist Churches—the acts I say of Mahommed Mustapha, the Bishops of Rome, the learned and protestant Joseph Charles Philpot—be pleased to discover and point out even faint shadow of difference? And yet, as I am credibly informed, the last of the parties concerned, crowned the literary labour of his life by sending forth only a few months prior to his departure, an able work against the Papacy, entitled, “The advance of Popery in this country.” Once more, in this fact, let the reader for his own warning take note, how through the short-sighted policy of human reason “EXTREMES ARE MADE LITERALLY TO MEET.”

But, to proceed. We have now by the way of sacrifice—sacrifice of that reverence which at the heart of the redeemed creature is to the word of God so most righteously due—reached an absolutely preposterous conclusion. It is this: let the reader mark it, and be astounded. *That ministerial SOUNDNESS IN THE WHOLE TRUTH OF GOD is established, by a deliberate, a determined CASTING AWAY OF ONE HALF OF THAT TRUTH*: hence by no possibility can any minister of the gospel become a “man of truth,” or be entitled to be dignified with the name, *until by this intentional, this reckless CASTING AWAY OF ONE HALF of Jehovah’s word, he in obstinate one-sidedness be content to hold THE OTHER HALF ONLY.*

But forasmuch as I stand bound, to the very uttermost to expose this unjustifiable system of deviation from the Bible, I shall yet further pursue the point: that is, I shall proceed to argue to its legitimate conclusion this unprecedented assumption with respect to ministerial soundness.

Let the reader then be pleased to take note, that EVERY PORTION, EVEN TO THE LEAST, of that which may properly be called TRUTH, is something which by a single glance at the divine nature—the august principle likewise at the root of universal creation—is made manifest as NOT USELESS; as that which in no solitary instance CAN be useless. God himself—is TRUTH. And Christ the incarnate Word, speaking of himself in a sense altogether special and peculiar, most emphatically asserts, “I am the way, THE TRUTH, and the life.” But not only is Christ *the truth*, but more: for bearing witness to the divinity of his beloved Master the apostle John in the first chapter of his gospel very plainly gives us to understand, that He is the Creator of all: as it is written, —“All things were made by him; and without him, was not any thing made that was made.” (Jo. i. 3.) But if so, then, unquestionably, all things which at the hand of God and his Christ have existence, must necessarily have their foundations IN TRUTH: for the Father is *truth*, the Son *truth*, the Holy Spirit proceeding from *the Father* and the Son also *truth*. It is this, and this alone,

which through that beneficence eternally inherent in the divine essence, makes all deviation on the part of the creature from that most august of principles, TRUTH, so dreadfully displeasing to God : for exactly in proportion to the departure, is the blessed harmony of that sublime principle in which the foundations of all existent things have been laid, contravened and frustrated. To say then, *that part—any part of truth—can be USELESS*, is again a contradiction in terms, just as great as to affirm that God can stultify Himself, or that darkness can be light. For all things at the hand of God—things physical as considered in the light of physical science—things moral as considered in the light of moral science—things spiritual as considered in the light of spiritual or divine science—have their deep deep foundations *in truth*. And since it must of necessity be admitted, that each particular segment of truth stands related to her entire circle ; in plain phrase, that every separate part of truth contains the goodness and glory of the principle and stands related to the whole, it ought by the least intelligent party to be apprehended, *that no portion of truth, however seemingly insignificant, (whether natural truth or truth divine), can by any possibility BE USELESS.*

But what, at the hand of the learned Mr. Philpot, is the judgment which I so righteously impugn ? Is it not that the more general passages of Jehovah's word, all His instruction, warnings, calls, and conditional promises to the non-elect, *are for all practical purposes* UTTERLY USELESS ; *are to be accounted* VAIN ; *are to be branded as* ARMINIAN LUMBER ; *and in that vile character* TOSSED OVERBOARD ? Moreover, that anything short of treatment flagrant as this, shall be held to mark error ? *He* therefore who refuses to submit to this reprehensible human decree,—*he* who scorns to acknowledge or sanction it,—*he* who declining to abet its criminality, panders not to the learned gentleman's opinions,—*he* who according] to the command of Scripture determines to hold Jehovah true and every man that would contradict Him a liar,—*he* for this offence is by the learned gentleman denounced as an errorist ; a preacher utterly unworthy to be recognized as a "*man of truth.*"

Grant then, for a moment, that Mr. Philpot and those whom he vouchsafes to exalt as *of the truth* are right,—are worthy of the title which they assume,—*do* by detecting the useless character of a vast part of Jehovah's revealed truth nobly vindicate their claim to possession of light and wisdom in excess of the light and wisdom of Deity,—grant it all,—and what remains ? I answer, ONE OR THE OTHER OF TWO FEARFUL CONCLUSIONS : let the reader accord me his attention, while for a witness against the P.R. Baptist Churches, I endeavour to make those conclusions fully manifest.

From the nature of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost,—from the eternal principle moreover in which by the wisdom of These the foundations of all things have been laid,—it has already been shown, that nothing which properly speaking may claim to be TRUTH, can by any possibility be useless. And that to pronounce any part of *truth* to be useless is manifestly a contradiction as great, as to affirm God to be foolish, or darkness to be light. If then the general portions of the Bible bearing upon the unregenerate — Jehovah's indiscriminate exhortations, invitations, warnings, calls, et cætera—*be indeed divine*, have been delivered by the *Holy Ghost*, have proceeded forth and come *from God*, and are *truth*, then, AS TRUTH, it is evident that they ought not to be USELESS.

But by the erudite Mr. Philpot himself, and by all such parties as he vouchsafes to acknowledge as “men of truth,” the general invitations, exhortations, calls, et cætera, are declared to be, first, “*Arminian*,” that is, error and a snare; secondly, “*lumber*,” that is, something altogether useless and unserviceable; thirdly, *fit only to be tossed overboard*, that is, something more profitable to be cast away than retained. Such the judgment of man. But truth—any truth—as I have already carefully shown can by no possibility be *useless*; can by no means become worthless, contemptible *lumber*; can never as a snare and trap deserve to be unceremoniously *cast out*. What follows? ONE OR THE OTHER OF TWO EQUALLY HIDEOUS CONCLUSIONS TO WHICH THE READER IS NOW REFERRED. First, that if the accomplished Mr. Philpot, and those whom he condescends to pronounce “men of truth” be right, if they have judged equitably in this case, then, forasmuch as *no real truth* (natural or divine) can by any possibility be useless, therefore the general exhortations, invitations, calls, et cætera, of the Bible, being now by the learned gentleman and his friends proved to be mere “*Arminian lumber*,” it is evident *that such exhortations, invitations, calls, et cætera of the Bible cannot be truth, cannot be divine, cannot be scriptural; but contrariwise, MUST BE FORGERIES, ARE CERTAINLY COUNTERFEIT, DID NEVER YET PROCEED FORTH AND COME FROM GOD*. Or secondly, if in defiance of the useless nature by Mr. Philpot and his friends ascribed to the general exhortations, it be insisted that those exhortations are *not* forgeries, but genuine revelations of the Holy Spirit, then, since the Father, the Son, the Holy Spirit, the reliable part of the Word, and the high principle in which the foundations of all existent things have been laid, ARE TRUTH, it is evident that contrary to the very nature of his Triune Being, contrary also to the reliable or more just portions of his Word, contrary also to the principle in which all things have their foundations, *Jehovah in one*

particular instance, the instance of the general exhortations, has made an exception—HAS DEPARTED FROM STRICT TRUTH. By which is meant, that without their having any real connexion with His nature, with the reliable or more just part of His Word, or with the grand principle at the foundation of creation, the Lord has gratuitously hitched on to the just or reliable part of His Word a multitude of passages, Arminian, contemptible, useless ; passages which can benefit nobody but must be a snare to everybody ; passages with no design but to strengthen Arminians and perplex Calvinists ; passages in short, which described in plain language are simply—**DELUSIONS—ABSURDITIES—LIES.**

To the delicate spiritual sense of my regenerate reader, I leave the impracticable task of choosing between these two fearful propositions : propositions to which, granting that Arminian character, that utter worthlessness which has by Mr. Philpot and his brethren been ascribed to God's general exhortations, we are absolutely shut up. But accepting now for a moment as fact, both the Arminian character and utter uselessness imputed to those exhortations, might it not in all righteousness be urged, *To what end then were they ever by God devised, and as AN ODISIOUS BLOT UPON ITS OTHERWISE GLORIOUS PAGES hitched on to the reliable part of the Bible ?*

But if to evade the utter confusion inseparable from the foregoing conclusions it be at this point pleaded, 'Nay ; the general exhortations of the Bible are neither forgeries, nor yet Arminian, nor yet useless ; but real truths, truths having a right to occupy a place on the inspired page, only *such truths as "MEN OF TRUTH" cannot honestly make use of* : then, of all such apologists I very pertinently demand, *Is the TRUTH OF GOD divided against itself, that MEN OF TRUTH, forsooth, should not honestly be able to make use of DIVINE TRUTH ?*

But ere quitting this particular head of my examination, I feel it imperative to call attention to the fact, that by reason of the utterly impracticable nature of the case which Mr. Philpot has undertaken to defend, this accomplished gentleman roundly contradicts upon one page that which he unhesitatingly affirms upon another. This disclosure I consider necessary, in order, if God will, to check that strong tendency in the masses to rely too implicitly on the declarations of man, while they forsake the pure light of Revelation. For freely to grant, that sanctified intelligence in connexion with the Word is to the Church of Christ a blessing of the very highest order, yet it is both painfully and humbly manifest, that the human reed is not always shaken by the wind of prophecy. Hence the necessity of bringing everything to the touchstone of the Word : an obligation which, when-

ever by the Church of Christ neglected, the truest charity which can be offered Her is, TO COMPEL HER TO BEHOLD—HOW FRAIL—HOW ALTOGETHER UNRELIABLE—THE HUMAN STAFF UPON WHICH SHE HAS SOUGHT TO LEAN.

This then I affirm, that in the second part of the "Review" from which I quote, the learned Mr. Philpot proceeds to lay down as fact, that which no man of sound mind will I apprehend feel disposed to dispute, to wit, that Mr. Wells in presuming to consider the general exhortations (even supposing them to be addressed to natural men) as altogether useless, is neither wise nor just. Thus does the learned gentleman himself when in the act of refuting Mr. Wells, see fit, as well he may, TO CONCEDE THE ENTIRE POSITION for which throughout this treatise I contend : to wit, that the general exhortations of Jehovah to the non-elect are neither meaningless nor useless, *but fraught with results the most momentous and incalculable ; results which by every despiser will be found to extend to the utmost bound of a never ending eternity.*

But, to the proof. The fact, as open to the scrutiny of any party sufficiently interested to inquire, stands thus. After having so far yielded to the allegation of Mr. Wells as to admit, that some of the general exhortations of Scripture are calls to mere reformation of conduct, of which kind he adduces instances, Mr. Philpot goes on to say,—“ But because there are scattered up and down the Scriptures exhortations of this nature, it by no means follows that all, or even the greater part, of the calls of the Bible to *natural men* are of this description. Nor does it at all follow, *because men are NOT in a SALVABLE STATE, or because natural men have NO POWER to perform spiritual actions, THAT THEY MAY NOT BE EXHORTED IN THE SCRIPTURES TO DO THEM.*” (p. 78.) Let the reader of this passage mark, first, That it openly admits the fact, that there are general exhortations of a purely spiritual character addressed by God to natural and non-elect men ; and, secondly, That the fact of such natural and non-elect men not being in a salvable state, nor having power to perform spiritual actions, *cannot, and does not*, invalidate the right of Jehovah to address to such parties His evangelical calls. These are Mr. Philpot's concessions, his clear recognition of the wisdom, will, and sovereign right of God, on page 78. But I ask the candid reader, whether these most righteous admissions are not to the uttermost contradicted by that strange teaching with which I have already made him familiar, as found on page 82 ? where it is said, “ Are ministers allowed to employ similar exhortations (that is, to those of the apostles,) now ? to which, if our solution of the difficulty be correct, THE ANSWER IS EASY. Do ministers now stand in that position, that their words shall ever become part of the sacred

volume? or can they feel that they use them under special inspiration? NO. Hence if they were to use them, it would be as *ridiculous* as the attempt to usurp the divine prerogative and work miracles."

Of the two equally plain, equally explicit, yet absolutely contradictory statements in the above paragraph, which I demand is true and to be retained,—and which rejected? In submitting this inquiry, I am deeply interested to obtain a righteous answer. Because, if the last is to be held reliable, then, it altogether makes against that position which in these pages I have assayed to defend; *but if the former, then, IT ENTIRELY AND TO THE UTMOST ESTABLISHES IT.*

Not satisfied, however, with that single assertion in favour of the general exhortations which has just been given, Mr. Philpot with all deliberation proceeds to record a second. It is as follows,—“But to this view it may be objected, that *spiritual exhortations* to natural men must be absurd, they having no power to perform them. This seems to be so convincing an argument to Mr. Wells, that he considers all such exhortations, if such were their drift, to be useless. . . . This argument, then, cuts two ways, and, in fact, IS WORTHLESS, as proving too much. They (the general exhortations) *may not be useless because Mr. Wells does not see THEIR USE, nor trifling because he cannot discern THEIR IMPORT AND BEAUTY.*” (p. 82.) Again I aver, that here, at unawares, Mr. Philpot absolutely concedes THE WHOLE POSITION FOR WHICH I CONTEND.

But not to dwell upon that fact, be it said, that in this passage for the second time we have, open admission both of the augustness and importance of the more general truths of Scripture. Twice over within the compass of a few pages, does this eminent scholar vouchsafe to justify God, and rescue from contempt those indiscriminate exhortations which Jehovah has seen fit to address to the masses. He gives honour to the Spirit, the glorious inspirer of the Word; ay, visits with censure the rationalistic assumption of Mr. Wells which would dishonour Him; saying, with no inconsiderable measure of intellectual caustic in the remark, “That such spiritual exhortations as in the Bible God has been pleased to address to sinners, *are not necessarily useless because Mr. James Wells happens to be blind to THEIR USE; not trifling because he has not spiritual discernment to detect THEIR TRUE IMPORT AND BEAUTY.*” In thus faithfully testifying, I bear this talented gentleman witness that what he has spoken he has spoken admirably. But now, to every intelligent being it becomes absolutely impossible to evade the question,—How then in the face of admissions such as these, can it under any conceivable circumstance be by this illustrious gentleman said, that those very exhortations which in

opposition to the gratuitous assumption of Mr. Wells he for the honour of God has thus nobly defended—are ARMINIAN—are worthless LUMBER—are things which, as possessed of NEITHER VALUE NOR BEAUTY, are by every individual minister worthy to be accounted a man of truth UNCEREMONIOUSLY CAST OVERBOARD?

Such the sad, the scarcely credible self-contradiction into which, through presuming to contend for a practice to which God in his righteousness will deign no shadow of countenance, this highly intellectual, this truly gracious man has been plunged. In full view of his dilemma, I esteem it in connexion with the children of light no unimportant part of my ministerial province to say, Take note how extremely dangerous a thing it is, in the slightest degree to deviate from that true, that sole standard of guidance, which with express view to the noblest interests of His children, has by the Spirit of God been revealed—THE HOLY BIBLE. And how in persistently assuming this right it is certain that the, loftiest powers with which by the hand of nature a man may be endowed will not avail to save from that reproach, which in respect of all such rationalizers has by God been so faithfully predicted: to wit,—“*Professing themselves to be WISE they became FOOLS.*” (Rom. i. 22.)

I now pass from this singularly strange, this absolutely self-contradictory judgment with regard to *that*, which alone is of virtue to constitute a gospel minister a “MAN OF TRUTH;” perhaps I ought rather to say, that which alone confers title, to be in that character crowned with the fillet of Mr. Philpot’s praise. To the brow of another be the diadem—the soul of another all distinction which stands in the suffrage of them who subscribe this illustrious gentleman’s opinion! But from the lightest taint of applause in respect of that which by letter or syllable—however minute—would militate against Jehovah’s most holy WORD, be my undebased Christian temples for ever free.

CHAPTER IV.

THAT INDEFENSIBLE PRACTICE OF NOT MINISTERING THE GOSPEL AS BY GOD COMMANDED, IN SUPPORT OF WHICH THE ABOVE TEACHING, THEORY, AND STRANGE STANDARD HAVE BEEN DEVISED, TRACED; AND THE PROBABLE PERIOD OF ITS RISE, AND WHOLE AMOUNT OF AUTHORITY IN ITS FAVOUR, EXHIBITED.

BEFORE leading the reader to a thorough examination of revealed truth in connexion with the Christian ministry, I have felt it to be of high importance to the end contemplated, that I should devote a few pages to the task, first, of tracing to its source the

practice of not ministering the gospel as by Jehovah commanded ; and secondly, of gathering up, and in concentrated form placing before the minds of inquirers, the entire authority upon which in the P. R. Baptist Churches that practice has been defended. In order that the simple—those who through a too credulous reception of assertion at the lips of man have been drawn aside from filial deference and obedience—may be emancipated from the thralldom of error, I have deemed this to be absolutely necessary. And with deep anxiety to carry out the inquiry aright, I have, like poor Mary, “done what I could :” that is, with a heart touched by the love of God, and an eye through grace single to His glory, I have done what lay in my power to elicit fact. In form as concise as may be, I record the result.

With regard to Mr. Philpot himself, whose unscrupulous defence of the false practice in question has given birth to these pages, he is, as to originating in this matter, blameless. Of him, I find, that by virtue of a naturally superior intellectual capacity, he had, while yet young, become distinguished beyond many contemporaries in his own college of Worcester, Oxford. Through the intervention of divine grace, however, he is next seen sacrificing worldly interest, and renouncing for the infinitely nobler portion of labour in the vineyard of Christ, his well grounded hopes of University preferment. Early in 1828 he accepted office in the ministry of the Episcopal Church ; in which establishment, with much zeal and true spiritual devotion he continued to exercise ministerial gifts of no common order, until under the repeated strokes of an enlightened conscience no longer able to endure the burden of those unscriptural rites and tenets, which so sadly detract from the evangelical character of the Church in question ; and which the spiritually enlightened among her members, are utterly unequal from the page of Scripture either to justify or explain. As a result of this powerful inward exercise, he in March 1835 formally abandoned his connexion with the Episcopal Church, and almost immediately united with the High Calvinistic or P. R. Baptists. From which time, (for by existing evidence it is clear that this distinguished man did not previously subscribe such views), he enthusiastically espoused the two highly unscriptural opinions which form so distinctive a feature in the theological system of those Churches. The first,—That the Gospel of Christ IS NOT to be preached as by Jehovah expressly commanded, viz., indiscriminately, or to sinners in the mass : the second,—That the Word of God IS NOT in its preceptory and practical portions to be diligently ministered to the elect, lest by coming into collision with the shortcoming, sloth, or other carnality of any, it should *mar the sweetness* of their gospel hearing ;

or by making too unmistakably manifest the fruits of grace, should *dissipate the delusive comfort* of doctrinal professors.

That I may not be supposed to have misrepresented the case when I have said, that from evidence extant it is clear, that previously to his union with the P. R. Baptist denomination Mr. Philpot did *not* subscribe these false views, let the reader, first, for indisputable proof as to this learned gentleman's deeply wise, nay ! altogether apostolic use of the preceptory or practical portions of the Word, examine the substance of his correspondence with the choice spirit of his flock while yet a labourer in the Established Church—Mrs. Rackham : vide published "Letters," 1831. Never, I confess, in any sermon, exposition, or commentary, do I remember to have met with anything so deeply earnest, so entirely scriptural, or in spirit and tone so nearly assimilated to the weeping exhortations of the great teacher of the Gentiles, the apostle Paul. So much, then, for this excellent man's original estimate of the value and use of the precept. And secondly, with reference to his zeal for the masses—his preaching of the gospel both by the way of private instruction and public sermon to adult and infant, indiscriminately—let the reader glance at that slight sketch of his Sabbath day labours of the same period, as found in the short memoir prefixed to his published "Letters," vide p. 18. But if it be more satisfactory to have the evidence of the fact to which I point from the learned gentleman's own pen, then, let the reader be pleased to consult the following very remarkable statement made by him in a work issued not many months previous to his death, viz., the "Memoir of William Tiptaft." Referring to his own preaching while yet a minister of the Church of England in the pulpit of the subject of the memoir, he says, "My sermon, which, if I remember right, was from Isaiah xlv. 24 :—'Surely shall one say, In the Lord have I righteousness and strength,' enabling me to show in whom were stored our righteousness and our strength, and that both were in Christ, and neither of them in ourselves. Though now so many years ago, I still retain some remembrance, not only of my text, *but of my manner of handling it*, and of the way in which I was listened to by the large congregation. As I was young in the ways and things of God, my sermon, doubtless, was neither very deep nor experimental ; *but I think it was* A FAITHFUL EXPOSITION OF THE TRUTH as far as I knew it, and most probably SUITED SUCH A MIXED CONGREGATION BETTER *than such a discourse as would meet my more matured judgment now.*" (See p. 21.) Thus much, in the second place, for this excellent man's original estimate of the ministerial duty of preaching the gospel to sinners. From the evidence extant, therefore, it is plain, that in sacrificing

for the two practical errors to which I point, his *original*, his *more* just estimate of divine precept and ministerial duty, Mr. Philpot erred not, until after his union with the P. R. Baptist Churches in 1835. And it is but an act of justice to that worthy man to record the fact, that in 1865, or exactly thirty years after his secession from the Episcopal Church, he sent forth his "Meditations on the preceptory portion of God's word;" in which, late reverting to those identical opinions with respect to the use and value of the precept with which as I have proved he had set out, he acknowledged the unscriptural nature of ONE of the above two long-homologated abuses, and practically abjured it.

From the above facts, therefore, it is manifest, that the learned Mr. Philpot was not in the matter at issue original in his conceptions; but that the ministerial abuse which on divine warrant I have here root and branch condemned, was current in the P. R. Baptist Churches long before the permanent union with that body of the illustrious brother so strenuously defending it. Turning therefore from the gifted brother to the Churches, I have made it my business to ascertain, by what sanction or warrant practice so diametrically opposed to the example and mandate of the Son of God, can by any body of professing Christians be justified. After much anxious research I find, that the Churches in question under the guidance of certain good and gracious men, had for a term of years prior to the appearance of Mr. Philpot in their midst, been established in their present practice; and the laity, at least, in a blind, unquestioning belief of its warrantability. But notwithstanding all the care and labour which I have bestowed upon the subject, I have been unable to find any party on whom with a measure of certainty I may fairly fix, as the founder of their false system.

There are not a few ignorant parties in these Churches, the sum of whose knowledge with respect to the learned Dr. John Gill is, that he was a high Calvinist, a Baptist, and an eminent theological writer. Of the substance of his voluminous works they know absolutely nothing: yet find it exceedingly convenient in their doctrinal bickerings to make mention at random of his name.

At the outset of my investigations, therefore, I confess, that I felt strongly disposed to conclude upon Dr. Gill; and a statement by no mean authority, with which in the course of my researches I chanced to meet, in large measure served to confirm me in that opinion. That statement, one portion of which no doubt is strictly correct, is by the late Dr. William Cunningham, Principal, and Professor of Church History, New College, Edinburgh, and runs thus. "Very few Calvinists have ever disputed the propriety and

the obligation of addressing to men, without distinction or exception, the offers and invitations of gospel mercy ; and the few who have fallen into error upon this subject—such as Dr. Gill, and some of the ultra-Calvinistic English Baptists of last century—have usually based their refusal to offer to man indiscriminately pardon and acceptance, and to invite any or all to come to Christ that they may receive these blessings, upon the views they entertained, not about a limitation of the atonement, but about the entire depravity of human nature—men's inability to repent and believe." (Hist. Theo. vol. ii. chap. xxiv. sec. x. p. 334.) With reference to this statement, one portion, viz., that which refers to the period in which the error under consideration had rise, is, as I have said, unquestionably true. But with respect to the truth of the other, that which refers to Dr. Gill, I am compelled on the evidence of the learned Dr. himself, to stand gravely in doubt. For searching with design to prove the head of this statement Gill's Body of Divinity, the work of all others in which with perspicuity and theological accuracy the writer's opinions *ought* to have been recorded, in that article specially entitled "On the Public Ministry," I find, that so far from agreeing with the views of the P. R. Baptist Churches, the opinion of Dr. Gill on both the above errors so distinctive of the system of that body, is in diametrical opposition. In proof of this fact, I append on either point his express statements.

1. DR. GILL'S TESTIMONY WITH REGARD TO THE APOSTOLIC CHARACTER OF THE MINISTRY. Referring to the Lord's appointment of the Apostles to the ministerial office, he says,—“But after his (Christ's) resurrection he enlarged their commission, and sent them into *all the world* to teach *all nations*, and preach the gospel to *every creature*.” (Book iii.) Again, touching the ministry as an ordinance of Christ, he says,—“But it is by the appointment of Christ, who ordered his disciples that what they heard in the ear they should preach on the house top ; that is, in the most public manner ; and therefore sent them into *all the world*, to preach the gospel to every creature under heaven ; and accordingly *Paul, that eminent minister of the word, preached it publicly, as well as from house to house*, and even from Jerusalem round about unto Illyricum.” (Ibid.) Again, showing what the subject-matter of this universal ministry is, he says, that it is,—“The gospel of salvation, the word of salvation, and salvation itself ; it is a publication of salvation by Christ ; it is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ came into the world to save the chief of *sinners* ; it declares that there is salvation in him, and in no other ; and that whosoever believes on him shall be saved : this is the gospel every faithful minister preaches, and

every sensible sinner desires to hear." (Ibid.) Again, with regard to the right manner of executing the ministry, he says, it should be,—“Fully and completely ; which is done when every truth is preached, and none concealed, and no duty omitted ; when nothing that is profitable is kept back, and when the whole counsel of God is declared ; and when it is preached fully, *as it was by the apostle Paul.*” (Ibid.) Yet again, with respect to the grand object or end of the ministry, he says,—“The ministry of the word is for the *conversion of sinners* ; without which churches would not be increased nor supported, and must of course come to nothing ; but the hand of the Lord being with his ministers, many in every age believe and turn to the Lord . . . and hence it is necessary in the ministers of the word to set forth the lost and miserable estate and condition of men by nature, the danger *they* are in, the necessity of *regeneration and repentance*, and of a better righteousness than their own, and of *faith in Christ* ; which things are blessed for the turning of men from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to God.” (Ibid.) The above are the express declarations of Dr. Gill with respect to the public ministry of the gospel : language cannot in any stronger terms set forth its nature as altogether unrestricted and free.

At this point, necessarily, I digress : in order to say, that I am thoroughly conversant with the fact, that those who determine to limit the commission of the ministry, do by a base, disingenuous quibble which they set up upon the word “offer,” studiously seek to evade the force of Jehovah’s command. Dr. Hawker, I deeply regret to be obliged to say, has not deemed it derogatory to the dignity of his calling as a minister of Christ, to condescend upon this despicable expedient ; and many, as will always be the case in an evil example, have not hesitated to follow him in his insidious device. The unhallowed trick is as follows. Because this particular word, “offer,” is not actually made use of in those indiscriminate addresses which were by Christ and his Apostles delivered to the masses, advantage is taken of that *fact*, to deny the purpose of God in submitting a proffer of life to the unregenerate. Under cover of it, the practice of these parties is, boldly and mendaciously to maintain, *that throughout the whole range of the Bible there is no such thing to be found as “offers” and “invitations.”* Now this treacherous dealing I hesitate not to brand, not merely as the very purest falsehood, but as *conscious knavery* : for the parties who adopt it, are each and all to the uttermost *conscious* of the contemptible nature of their juggle. Were this fraudulent method of dealing indeed admissible, then, adopting it as an instrument of robbery and spoil, I undertake before heaven, the earth, and hell, to denude the Christian min-

istry of any and every doctrine to the free publication of which it lays claim. For in order to effect this hideous wrong, all that is requisite is, to select some synonymous term to the word used by the Apostles in laying down that particular truth or doctrine which we have determined to deny ; taking care that the synonymous term chosen be such, as has not in any instance been employed by the sacred writers ; and then with bold, brazen, mendacious, nay ! grossly knavish assertion insist, *that from Genesis to Revelation there is no such thing to be found in God's book.* This is the melancholy expedient of Dr. Hawker, as may be seen in that portion of an utterly worthless tract, lately republished with high-sounding encomium in the magazine called "Gospel Standard : " and by publication and republication of intellectual jugglery base and vile as this, the souls of the unwary and uneducated are first cozened into error, next instigated to persistent disobedience. In order therefore to a thorough exposure of this radically jesuitical principle of misinterpretation, let us for a few moments revert to that express term, which with a view to prop up and make to stand a legless, armless, headless doctrinal idol, has by these disingenuous controversialists been selected : I mean the word "*offer.*" Now granting that that word, written in so many alphabetical characters is not to be found in the Bible, is it therefore as these parties assert, undoubtedly true, that THE SUBSTANCE of no such thing as a proffer of life to the despiser is to be found throughout the length and breadth of that Book ? no such thing, moreover, as an evangelical invitation to these to be detected on its sacred pages ? Take then, as an instrument of proof, any one (I care not which) of the innumerable passages scattered throughout the Gospel by John, calling to faith, and let any candid, truth-loving, truth-speaking party say, whether a proffer of life on the equitable condition of believing on Christ is not contained therein ? As the chiefest of these, the king-passage and representative of them all, take the following : "I am the resurrection, and the life : he that believeth in me, though he were dead yet shall he live : and whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die." In the face of this sublime asseveration, I ask the man, the woman that loves truth rather than a lie, is there not, subject only to the condition of faith, the whole SUBSTANCE of a proffer of life here ? Dare any living soul, in view of the judgment and inquisition of God, incur the damning shame of denying it ? Take next this specimen of a sister class of passages, to wit, "And ye will not come to me, that ye might have life." Now granting that the word "invitation" is not in alphabetical symbol to be found in the Bible, yet in face of this passage I demand, Is there not by *the Lord Christ* something here submitted, absolutely necessitat-

1 the part of the persons to whom it is addressed an act of natural will? And if there be, then, is not that something VERY SUBSTANCE both of a proffer of life and an invitation?

Yet Dr. Hawker in the highly reprehensible, the altogether disgraceful Tract recently with praise by the false witnesses in the "Gospel Standard" republished, has roundly affirmed that the entire text of the Book of Life there is no solitary instance of invitation or offer. His express words are, "And, moreover, I add yet further, that in their (the apostles') example, preachers of the gospel find *no authority whatever* to make offers of invitations in an indiscriminate manner to sinners in general; nor do the Scriptures furnish *a single instance* where Christ and the apostles have ever made offers but to the people of God."

Without again recurring to what I have recorded above, or in place citing the testimony of the parable of the marriage supper, hear now what in answer to this gratuitously untruthful fiction I have to say. In opposition to Dr. Hawker, and every sort of statement thus unprincipled and mendacious, I affirm, whether it be he, or whether it be they, these partisans of error can by no possibility preach to the masses in the terms made by Christ and his inspired Apostles, without in their own hearts, to their own confusion, and through proclamation of THE VERY SUBSTANCE of invitation and offer, being compelled to deny their own most gratuitous assertion. Before any number of competent judges in the meaning of language, I here challenge them to the task: let them make proof, if they dare venture of the stuff of their vaunted wisdom. The impossibility in this case—mark well what I say—the impossibility to which I depute them is such, that it forms the sole reason why preaching in the terms of the gospel—the terms made use of by Christ and his Apostles—has long been assiduously banished from the doors of the P. R. Baptist Churches. Their teachers well know, they cannot preach in the terms of the Lord of glory and his glorious Apostles, *except by destroying at a single stroke, both their inordinate pride, and the thin veil of their rationalistic system.* Why? Hear it every victim of this flesh-conceived scheme. It lies immediately on their preaching in the terms of the Lord Jesus Christ, and those of his servants Peter and Paul, the conscience and the consciences of their hearers must necessarily be made to bear witness, THAT EVEN "MEN OF TRUTH" DO INFAL-
 LIBLY BRING INTO BEING THE ENTIRE SUBSTANCE OF INVITATION AND OFFER!! Of this they are so entirely, so painfully conscious, they not only depart from all such preaching, but persistently and very wickedly malign.

Not content with subterfuge—I say, jesuitical chicane base

and despicable as this, Dr. Hawker next by deliberate falsehood proceeds to buttress his evil, his antisciptural argument. Endeavouring to compel the earlier ministry of the Apostles to subserve the deception he intends, he says, "From the ordination of the apostles let the reader follow their footsteps in the exercise of their ministry during the whole time the Lord continued among them, and let him *examine closely* if he can discover a single offer or invitation given by those faithful followers of the Lord indiscriminately to all. *I have looked with carefulness on this ground, and cannot find an iota leading to the conclusion. Indeed the thing itself is impossible.*" (G. S. 1873, p. 205.)

In face of this passage (whether more false than ludicrous, or ludicrous than false, I leave to the judgment of others) let the reader be pleased to observe, that the period by Dr. Hawker expressly chosen as a ground of proof is, from the sending forth of the Apostles to preach until the ascension of Christ: and be it specially noted, that this Rev. Doctor solemnly pretends, first, that ere making his statement he has given careful attention to the subject; and secondly, that the statement which he thus deliberately makes, is made in the interests of divine truth. Mark then, that the business to which by Dr. Hawker we are here deputed is, to follow throughout the period expressly chosen the footsteps of the apostles, and examine closely into the nature of their ministry. But the fact manifest from the page of Scripture is, that except only the brief notice in Mark, viz., "And they went out and preached that men should *repent*," vi. 12, which makes utterly against Dr. Hawker's error; and the sister passage in Luke, viz., "And they departed and went through the towns preaching *the gospel*," ix. 7, which with equal clearness makes against the said error, both which be it carefully remembered occur in *the very same short context* which records the appointment of the Apostles to this work of preaching, there is in the New Testament throughout the whole period which as a ground of proof has been chosen, absolutely NO RECORD. Of the details of the apostolic ministry therefore during this period, we can know positively nothing. Yet this very *able* (for so in lying phrase is he by the venal scribes of the Standard called) defender of an antisciptural dogma, with mock earnestness calls upon us (I use his own words) to "*examine closely*" into the early ministry of the Apostles, of which exists no shadow of record; and not only examine into this non-existent record, but ascertain therefrom the certainty of his own worthless affirmations. I venture however to reject the sublime logic of this highly unscrupulous controversialist; and maintain against him, that the case being as I have represented, in place of the impracticable counsel by his

wisdom thus emphatically tendered, the true wisdom is, to desist. For whatever the absurd notion of this greatly conscientious man may be, as to the possibility of compelling that which is by nature impracticable to become practicable, the fact abides, that despite the strange logic of all such astute reasoners, that impracticability to which as existing in the nature of things I have pointed, stands firm and unyielding for ever. Let the intense admirers of scholarly reasoning, ministerial probity, and scriptural accuracy of that peculiar type which makes even angels weep, (I mean the rapturous scribes of the Gospel Standard), satiate in the above specimen of controversial candour their delight.

But the above is not all: for this very profound man, with a recklessness of regard for his own integrity truly pitiable, thus rather rashly "stretches himself beyond his measure." Not content with having earnestly charged his dupes with all diligence to examine into nothing, and out of nothing evolve something, he if to render the joke yet more exquisitely, yet more intolerably tense, next (but under what regard for Christian veracity I forbear to say) with the utmost effrontery proceeds to inform us, that himself has actually accomplished this impossible task. His press words are, "*I (Hawker) HAVE LOOKED WITH CAREFULNESS ON THIS GROUND, and cannot find an iota leading to the conclusion.*" Here with naked falsehood in one hand, glaring absurdity in the other, Dr. Hawker recklessly endeavours to stify his antiscritptural error. The falsehood with which I expressly charge him is this, that with all boldness, ay! utter contempt of decency he avers, that not casually, but with great refusalness he has examined into certain scriptural evidence as if *did exist*, when in truth and verity such scriptural evidence *does not exist*. And the hideous absurdity for indulgence in which I condemn him is, that he virtually affirms the possibility of finding something out of nothing, to wit, a sound scriptural conclusion out of no evidence; nay! THAT HE HIMSELF HAS ACTUALLY DONE IT.

Now mark what I have to say: it is, That if this very conscientious divine before making the false statement which he has made, had indeed taken that step which he falsely affirms he has it has *not* taken, he could not have been ignorant of the fact to which I point: in which case, is it to be supposed, that he would have rendered himself openly chargeable with the heinous falsehood and glaring absurdity for which I have publicly impeached him? It cannot be supposed. What conclusion alone remains? This: to the utter confusion of those who by a lie have praised him, be it legibly recorded. To wit, that this Rev. Doctor vouched *not in controversy* to give diligence to the work of search-

ing the Scriptures for authority, but found it a millionfold more convenient in the defence of his error to fabricate false statements out of his own heart : but in order to give these worthless statements of his own devising weight, hesitated not by a second falsehood to affirm, that he *had* carefully sought them out from the Scriptures when he had *not* from that source sought them out ; nay ! when for his unholy assumption the Scriptures afforded no shadow of tangible evidence. Even thus, do I pour upon the false argumentation of Dr. Hawker everlasting and richly merited contempt. Had the futile researches of this highly conscientious divine ended in nothing, I had probably, in charity, spared his memory an humbling exposure : but since they have abounded unto palpable falsehood, and since with purpose to deceive the unwary that falsehood has been reproduced, and by the insidious scribes of the " Gospel Standard " commended as *valuable authority*, I have deemed it my imperative duty to give this writer also a niche in the pantheon of the judges ; and to make the spirit of his work in this respect fully manifest. Is this man's intellectual capacity I ask at all exalted by his own triumphant but contemptible asseveration, that he has diligently and carefully examined into nothing, and with all the ministerial acuteness which he can bring to bear upon the assay, has been unable in that land of barrenness to detect a single " OFFER " or " INVITATION." Is he surprised ? Are his admirers who have falsely praised him in the gate ? I conclude with his own very stupid averment, to wit, " INDEED THE THING ITSELF IS IMPOSSIBLE."

But Dr. Hawker determines to give posterity still further occasion to admire his ingenuity as a controversialist, his deference to Christ as a minister of the gospel. For, obliged to concede that the apostolic mission as defined ere His ascension by Christ, extends to the world and to every creature, this greatly self-complaisant divine still endeavouring to evade the Lord's behest sagely gives us to understand, that preaching the gospel TO ALL MEN, does by some fatality which however he condescends not to explain, contain the idea of preaching the gospel TO NO MAN ; yea ! in place of signifying a preaching of the gospel to *somebody*, embodies in itself the quaint notion of a vague indefinite preaching to *nothing and to nobody*, but always, IN THE AUDIENCE of men. Since it may at a single glance be seen, that this stupid proposition is full sister to that which immediately precedes it ; to wit, that to bring a just conclusion out of non-existent evidence, is both possible, and an act which has by Hawker himself been accomplished, I shall not dwell upon it ; but simply ask, Does the Lord, or do the inspired Apostles deign upon Dr. Hawker's absurdity ? In the grand work of preaching to the unregenerate, is not the voice of Incarnate Deity, incess-

santly, "Verily, verily, I say *unto you*?" Is not that of his Apostles precisely similar. Hear Peter and the eleven. "But Peter, standing up with the eleven, lifted up his voice and said *unto them*, Ye men of Judæa, and all ye that dwell at Jerusalem, be *this known unto you*, and hearken to my words." (Acts ii. 14.) In like manner Paul: listen. "Be it known *unto you* therefore men and brethren, that through this man is preached *unto you* the forgiveness of sins." (Acts xiii. 38.) Even so Philip: mark it. "Then Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and preached Christ *unto them*." (Acts viii. 5.) These infallible testimonies of Scripture, I place over against the gratuitous inventions of Dr. Hawker, and I publicly call upon all those who in their guile have commended this reverend gentleman, TO TAKE NOTE. And be it certified to them, that lightly though they, for the ensnaring of the simple, deem of the act of exalting fraud, yet when the day of the divine recompenses is at length come, their false judgment shall not lack of its award.

But Dr. Hawker, supposing always the tract in question to be his, of which, as far as I myself am concerned I have no doubt, goes yet further: takes upon him with consummate boldness (a boldness assumed doubtless to veil the baseless nature of his case, and by dogmatism for lack of evidence impose upon weak minds), takes I say upon himself as flatly to deny the apostolic practice of *persuading men*, as he does the fact of divine invitation. His express words are, "But we read of no offers nor *persuasions*. . . . To preach Christ they knew to be their province. To *persuade* to the acceptance of Christ they knew to be his (the Holy Spirit's)." This deliberately hatched falsehood, except only in pity for the very feeblest of the inquirers—compassion for the simple who by disgraceful dealing of this kind have been deceived and led astray—I should have deemed too contemptible even to brand: nevertheless for the sake of the ignorant and deluded, I vouchsafe by the Word of infallible truth to set the mark of the divine disapprobation upon it. Hear then, every simple soul in Zion! It is written,—“And with many other words did he (Peter) testify and exhort, saying, *Save yourselves* from this untoward generation.” (Acts ii. 40.) And again,—“*And now, brethren*, I wot that through ignorance ye did it. . . . *Repent ye therefore and be converted*, that your sins may be blotted out.” (Acts iii. 17, 19.) And again,—“Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord we *persuade men*.” And yet again,—“Now then we are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us: *we pray you in Christ's stead*, be ye reconciled to God.” (2 Cor. vii. 20.) And for a copestone and crown, yet again,—“And when they (the Jews of Rome) had appointed him (Paul) a day, there came many to him into his lodging; to whom he expounded and testified the kingdom of

God, *persuading them* concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses, and out of the prophets, from morning till evening." (Acts xxviii. 23.)

Enough, enough : with their knavery full upon them, I leave such judges of antisciptural judgment, such propounders of mendacious statement, to the righteous rebuke of Jehovah. It is evident from the most casual glance at their assertions, that in support of their base, rationalistically devised dogmas, such parties will not hesitate to say anything.

But, to return from this indispensable digression, be it said, such and such as I have given them are the declarations of the learned Gill with respect to the gospel ministry. I cannot suspect this excellent man, under cover of the scriptural language of which he makes use, and in face of the noble example of Paul to which *twice over* he so emphatically points, to be a cherisher at heart of any of the above disgraceful equivocation. I confess, therefore, that with reference to the accuracy of that portion of the statement of Principal Cunningham which bears upon Dr. Gill, I stand altogether in doubt. But secondly,—

2. DR. GILL'S TESTIMONY AS IT RELATES TO MINISTERIAL OBLIGATION IN CONNEXION WITH THE PRECEPT. What holds he with regard to the right or wrong of exhibiting and enforcing the will of God, as made undeniably manifest in His gospel commands? Touching the practical bearing of the ministry as distinct from the doctrinal, he says, "The ministry of the word takes in the several duties of religion, which are to be insisted on in their course ; and saints are to be exhorted to the exercise of them upon evangelical principles and motives ; they are to be taught to observe whatever Christ has commanded, every ordinance of his, and every duty both with respect to God and men ; they are to be put in mind to be ready to every good work, and to maintain them for necessary uses ; every duty, public and private, personal, relative, and domestic, as well as every doctrine, are to be inculcated throughout the course of the gospel ministry." (Ibid.)

Here on the *second head of error* so distinctive of the P. R. Baptist system, is proof as to the diametrical difference of opinion existing between Dr. Gill and the ultra-Calvinistic teachers. Fact, seeming to render even more improbable still, that part of the statement of Dr. Cunningham which bears more particularly on Gill.

But with regard to the other part of his statement, that which refers to the ultra-Calvinistic Baptists of England, and the period of their origin, it is evidently correct. There were in the latter half of the last century a few small churches of this class to be found in the land : but so few, as to be scarcely sufficient, in the

ordinary acceptation of that term, to deserve the name of a denomination. I question whether there be any reliable evidence extant, by which to fix either the exact date of their origin, or the name of their founder. As this is of no great importance, it may very safely be left as above. One thing however in connexion with this recency of rise it is desirable to point out: to wit, that in its objectionable part, this exceedingly modern system of the P. R. Baptist Churches is a departure from Christian usage absolutely unknown in all previous ages of the Church of Christ. For if you turn to the period of the last great revival of evangelical light and godliness under Whitfield, Berridge, Harris, Roland, Newton, in England, the Erskines, and their fellow-labourers in Scotland, such ministerial practice as that which I have condemned is not to be found there. Or if ascending the stream of time to a still higher point, you examine the era of Cromwell and the puritans, neither is it to be found there. Enquire yet earlier, at the teaching common to the Reformation, in Germany, France, Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Northern Provinces of Europe; or in our own land—that of Cranmer and his fellow-sufferers in England, Knox and his faithful coadjutors in Scotland—it is not to be found there. Or if extending research to that long gloomy period of papal darkness going before, during which those valiant little communities the Albigenses and Waldenses seem to have been the only witnesses to divine truth in the whole earth, we enquire at the ministerial system peculiar to these, neither is it to be found there. Demand earlier still, at the ministry of the churches founded by the Apostles, as current throughout the first five centuries of the Christian era, it is not even to be found there. Search for it in the ministry of the Apostles themselves, that also of the Divine Saviour, their King, and lo, there also, as certainly, is it not to be found. Is anything more really needed, in order to prove this antisciptural emanation of the human brain altogether and utterly despicable?

But in this particular department of my enquiry, the point of importance is neither epoch nor date, but *authority*. Date and origin could only have been valuable inasmuch as they might have contributed to shed light upon the question of—AUTHORITY. Leaving therefore under that era to which I have assigned it, the rise or origin of the error here exploded, I proceed to direct attention to the grand matter of authority.

Among all the more eminent preachers had in remembrance by the oldest members of the P. R. Baptist denomination, I have found no individual expressly quoted in the Churches by way of authority on this error. The names of some aged and very godly ministers who throughout the past half century have laboured

in these Churches, stand out in bold relief from those of a crowd of less competent parties, as able men in the partial or one-sided system which they had espoused. But from all the writings of these with which it has been my fortune to come in contact, and from all the information which I have been able to glean respecting them, I have no reason to conclude that any single individual of their number either considered himself to be, or has by the Churches been regarded as being, an express authority on the question at issue. To what point then in the whole Christian world shall we turn, in order to discover that which secretly and tacitly, yet not the less certainly, is recognized as the all-sufficient authority in this matter?

The Rev. gentleman whose teaching and theory I have effectually subverted, by frequently quoting as high authority on divine subjects a certain human name, incessantly testifying his high esteem for the spiritual wisdom of its possessor, has himself-furnished me with a clue to what in the matter of this dispute may I believe very safely be laid down, as the secretly recognized authority of the P. R. Baptist Churches. That authority, under perfect willingness if mistaken to accept correction, I declare to be, *Certain passages in the writings, and a corresponding practice peculiar to the later years of the ministry of a very recent servant of Christ, viz., the Rev. William Huntington.* In this remarkable personage, I am strongly inclined to conclude we do find the universally recognized Oracle, to the wisdom and teaching of whom on the point in dispute, secret appeal—appeal in the hidden chamber of the heart—is wont to be made. I am not however on the strength of the knowledge which I possess entitled to say, that Mr. Huntington ever in so many express words insisted upon the false practice which I condemn. But for the three following reasons which I record apart, I feel fully justified in fixing upon him as the fountain of appeal, the all-sufficient authority, through whom the several members of the P. R. Baptist body justify to their own consciences their error.

1. Because sometimes covertly, and in one instance at least not dubiously expressed, there may in his printed works be found an opinion at variance with the ministerial practice of the Apostles; to wit, of addressing through the ministry of the sanctuary general exhortations to the unregenerate. That this may appear, I subjoin that particular passage to which reference has been made. In a sermon published in 1786 the Rev. gentleman says,—“I have often observed, when I have been hearing a sermon, and the power of God has attended the pure truth that has been delivered, so that the dew of heaven seemed to drop upon every branch (*Job xxix. 19*), when the conclusion has drawn near, a word of

caution (THAT IS, PRECEPTORY EXHORTATION) *to the just, and a word of warning* (THAT IS, APOSTOLIC EXHORTATION) *to the wicked*, has been sufficient to dry up all the dew that fell on the floor (Judges vi. 39,) and to wither all the budding hopes that moved in the weakling's heart; we cannot call this keeping the best wine till the last. This is more like the profuse cow that gives a pail full of milk, and then kicks it over the milkmaid." (See, The Law Established by the faith of Christ.)

2. Secondly, Because from published remonstrances bearing on this point, which by certain of his own early friends had in later life been addressed to him, it is probable, that the concluding years of his ministry to a large extent illustrated the opinion to which I have pointed. A remarkable specimen of the remonstrances mentioned is to be found in the work of Mr. Carter, of Portsea, a friend of Mr. Huntington in the earlier days of his ministry; who in that work calls the Rev. gentleman's attention to the fact, of his having departed from the original line of his labours, and adopted a new style of preaching with a view to bolster up and please certain professors of experience. This work was published in 1810, just after the chapel in Tichfield Street was destroyed by fire: which event, but without malice, Mr. Carter suggests to be a voice from God. The work was entitled, "Eight letters on Mr. Huntington's spiritual death:" and the writer was himself a faithful minister of Christ.

3. And thirdly, Because, were further evidence yet necessary, it is found in that invariable effect which study of the writings of this author has power to produce upon the mind, as attested by some on whom in the work of the vineyard it has pleased the Lord to put distinguished honour: parties who to a very painful degree had themselves for a season experienced that effect. I allude to the tendency of those writings more and more to seal up the heart, silence the lip, and cut off liberty of soul, in the grand work of testifying to sinners the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. A striking testimony to the tendency here asserted, may be met with in the memoir of a late devoted servant and witness of Christ, entitled, "The life and labours of Duncan Mattheson, missionary to the Army of the Crimea."

Now with regard to the actual fact that the above three things, 1. the half spoken sentiments of Mr. Huntington—2. the well-known tendency peculiar to the ministerial practice of his later years—and 3. the moral influence of his religious writings—have largely contributed to the development of the false system now current in the P. R. Baptist Churches, thus exalting into the position of an authority on the error in question—a standard of

appeal in the imaginary duty of its vindication—the person of Mr. Huntington, I, fearless of contradiction, assume leave to assert that there can be no reasonable ground of doubt. For the great defender of the false system himself, whose sophistical reasonings in these pages I have overthrown, even the learned Mr. Philpot, has with his own pen very plainly recorded it. At least then as far as he himself is concerned, and he in the matter under consideration is the representative of his churches, I am in a position to show, that there can be no doubt whatever as to the source from which in coming forth as the champion of the false system here branded, he derives *his* inspiration; no question as to the party to whose superior spiritual acumen he in heart defers, as *his* standard of appeal: for, be it reiterated, he himself has plainly witnessed and established it.

In the “Gospel Standard” for June 1863, reviewing a republication of “Select Sermons by Ralph Erskine,” the learned gentleman in his opening remarks on the distinguished Scottish brothers thus plainly and distinctly delivers himself. “It is quite true that several of the notes which they blew in sounding the great (or gospel) trumpet, by no means fully harmonize with *the purer, clearer, and more thoroughly gospel sound gone forth in these latter days, since the immortal Coalheaver (that is, Huntington) EXPOUNDED THE WAY OF GOD MORE PERFECTLY.*” In this extract, through his own recording pen we are by Mr. Philpot plainly given to understand, from what particular source he derives *his* warrant for that practice, which with a far larger measure of human zeal than heavenly judgment, he in 1841, exactly two and twenty years previously, had set his face like a flint to defend. Hence whatever may be the opinion entertained by individual members of the Huntingtonian and P. R. Baptist Churches with regard to authority for that reprehensible practice against which in this Treatise I reclaim, it is evident, that Mr. Philpot himself entirely concurs with me; plainly pointing—as the high standard of appeal in this matter—to the Rev. William Huntington.

But, to digress for a brief moment from the point more immediately at issue, let the reader in passing be pleased to mark, what from the passage above quoted is undeniable; to wit, that our illustrious author, as one thoroughly versed in the history of the Church of God from the ascension of Christ to his own time, was sensible that that purer, clearer, more thoroughly gospel sound of which he speaks, was absolutely non-existent—not to be found—in any previous age. This singularly strange assertion I cannot pass by, without expressing the unqualified regret which I feel, at the very weighty manner in which it reflects on the divine wisdom. *For if not only the Erskines come short of the purer gospel light;*

but all besides who as ministers of the Church have ever preceded them, then, it follows, that until that most auspicious dawn—that day of the appearing in the vineyard of the Rev. William Huntington—the Lord Jehovah, from the forthgoing of the gospel dispensation at the hand of the Baptist to the time of Mr. Huntington, (the Son of God and his Apostles by very nature of their testimony included), has never had in the world a single pure, clear, and thoroughly sound gospel teacher. Might we not in contemplating this opinion well be moved to inquire, Is the God of Israel like indeed to the gods of Jezebel? one that throughout near eighteen centuries in utter disregard of the honour, the highest spiritual interests also of His church—that church the purchase of His Son's blood—has been talking, or pursuing, or journeying, or peradventure sleeping, and in need of being awakened?

But leaving digression, I here on the strength of the learned Mr. Philpot's admissions proceed with all plainness to lay it down, that the erroneous practice which I have felt it to be my Christian duty to condemn, is for its authority *not* referable to the Bible, nor to any divine or stable authority whatever, but to *a mere man*: to certain passages in the writings, certain example in the later years of the ministry, of the Rev. Wm. Huntington. Is this, I submit, a sufficient warrant on which 'in the' grand ordinance of the regeneration, the public ministration of the gospel, to set aside the imperial mandate of Christ—and thus, practically impeach the wisdom, will, and sovereign right of Jehovah, as in that divine mandate inextricably involved?

One thought more in connexion with this subject, and I shall have done: let me endeavour to make it brief: it is this. Since the death of Mr. Huntington, two ministers of the P. R. Baptist Churches—both accounted able men—have in defence of the dogma which I explode, came forth to the world as high champions. These champions, each by his own admirers deemed invincible, are the Rev. James Wells, and the Rev. Joseph Charles Philpot. But instead of fighting shoulder to shoulder for the maintenance of their humanly devised practice, they have to a large extent fought against each other: the one, asserting, that the general exhortations of Scripture as by Jehovah addressed to the masses, are of no spiritual interpretation whatever; the other, proving to a demonstration that they are: but in either case, through misinterpretation and self-contradiction, casting a flood of light upon the indefensibility of that position which both had undertaken to maintain. Thus far then, this voluntary championship of error has been of service: for the naked manifestation by its most redoubted champions of the indefensibility of the dogma sought to be set up, is, I affirm, a practical confirmation of

the hand of opponents, of the faithfulness of those demonstrations which have in the foregoing pages been recorded.

But let the reader still for a moment chasten his spirit to patience, while I make naked the RANK RATIONALISM—concentrate also into a focus and set before the eye of his mind the scattered RAYS OF AUTHORITY—upon which in the P. R. Baptist Churches is advocated that antisciptural practice, which I have here on divine authority condemned.

With regard then to the first of the abovementioned champions, viz., Mr. James Wells, be it carefully observed, that the sole reason which in justification of *his* departure from apostolic practice has by that preacher been advanced, is as follows. [To wit, that if those indiscriminate exhortations which have by the Son of God and his Apostles been so liberally addressed to the masses, are to anything more than mere external reformation, then, forasmuch as without the constraining grace of the Holy Spirit they will never be effectually obeyed, he, Mr. James Wells, not being able to apprehend *any further purpose to be served by them*, must of necessity consider them to be useless: nay, worse! as a mere *trifling with men*, tauntingly, and as telling them with apparent sincerity to do impossibilities. According therefore to the shewing of this redoubted champion himself, the inability of HIS HUMAN REASON to grasp the divine purpose in those gospel exhortations which in infinite wisdom have been addressed to the non-elect, is the sole ground upon which *liberty is assumed* to set aside the wisdom, will, and sovereign right of God. Behold in this admission, the pure, the unadulterated RATIONALISM, which is at the root of that departure from apostolic practice against which in the name of God I protest.

But, be it asked, If the authority by Mr. Wells chosen for his procedure be admissible—if the standard of natural, nay! fallen human reason may regulate as to what revealed truth shall in the Church of Christ be received, and what rejected, then, which part of divine doctrine, I submit, shall we be able to retain? Is there sufficiency of power in Mr. Wells's natural reason to investigate the strange fact of the self-existence of the Deity? No. Or to cause him to comprehend the mystic secret of the Trinity in Unity of the Godhead? No. Or to make him satisfactorily understand the inscrutable principle on which Jehovah regulates in individual election His choice? No. Or give him insight into the cause for which, in every instance of election to life, the period ere effectual calling has been fixed at so long? No. Or will it in any other respect place Mr. Wells in the secret light of the counsels of his Maker—exalt him to the sublime position of the Lord's confidant—dignify as partner with Him in the incommunicable mysteries

of eternity? Nay, verily! Are we then, I submit, *on the rationalistic principle of Mr. Wells* to abandon as useless and trifling every portion of revealed truth, to the immeasurable height, the unfathomable depth of which, *the poor ability of CREATURE REASON does not extend?* Might not the archangels in light—their loftiest—who never yet dared to question one mysterious purpose of God which exceeded their expansive comprehension, well because of this new standard by which in the Church of Christ to regulate the reception or rejection of divine truth, be struck dumb with overpowering astonishment? For by it, in that ordinance which is for the instruction and warning of the nations—ordinance which, as the chief instrument of the Spirit in the work of the regeneration forms the substance of a peremptory command—are the wisdom, will, and sovereign right of God not merely heartlessly sacrificed, but publicly and intentionally maligned.

So much then for the authority upon which, in *his* deliberate departure from apostolic practice, is grounded the justification of Mr. Wells. Would any sanctified spirit, I ask, with an intelligent view of the whole position, desire for a single instant to share it with him? I frankly confess, not I.

But the other highly estimable gentleman who comes forward as a champion in this matter, though at the outset of his argument setting himself in antagonism to this undisguised rationalizing of Mr. Wells, yet for lack of any better, any more stable ground upon which to find rest for the sole of his foot, *does himself* immediately fall back upon that identical reliance on *reason*, which even with a measure of sarcasm he had in his opponent so justly condemned. Let the reader once more mark the proof.

With a view to take more becoming, more lofty ground than that chosen by Mr. Wells, this learned gentleman does not in plain language affirm, that the exhortations of Jehovah can under any circumstance whatever become useless or trifling. He had ample wisdom to see, that that must necessarily prove precarious ground for a theory: hence sets out by freely admitting in connexion with those general exhortations which God has seen fit to address to the masses, the existence of a divine purpose. That purpose he signifies to be, *the gathering out from the condemned and sinful mass of such souls as shall be saved.* This admission, unquestionably, wears an infinitely more scriptural aspect than the hard rationalistic assertion of Mr. Wells. Keeping it therefore full in view, be it asked, Does Mr. Philpot in any intelligible, any positive sense, *allow* what he thus frankly *admits*? does he intend us to believe, that that purpose of God which in connexion with the general exhortations he has conceded, is *REAL*—has an absolute *EXISTENCE*? The evidence, unfortunately, shows that he does

not : *but that he DENIES what he ADMITS ; actually RECANTS that which he GRANTS.* If this can be shown, then, the above concession of divine purpose in the general exhortations must, even by this learned gentleman's most ardent admirers, be admitted to be merely ostensible. Mark then, that while with a view to take more becoming ground than that occupied by Mr. Wells, this learned gentleman frankly admits a divine purpose in connexion with the general exhortations, hence, that these general exhortations are not as by Mr. Wells asserted, either trifling or useless ; yet with the very next breath he invalidates the entire admission, *falling back upon the precise position of his opponent—to wit, that the general exhortations by himself admitted to have a use, have in reality no use ; but are as by Mr. Wells asserted altogether USELESS AND TRIFLING.* For just as I have affirmed, that is, with the breath next following his admission he lays down as a true solution of P. R. Baptist difficulty, "That the exhortations general and special, in short all truths bearing on man which have ever by inspiration of God been revealed, have been lodged in the Bible *not for the purpose which he has admitted, not for exhortation of the masses with a view to the ingathering of the elect, BUT WHOLLY AND SOLELY FOR THE SPIRIT'S USE ;* and, therefore, if any minister with a view to the fulfilment of that purpose of Jehovah which in connexion with the general exhortations the learned gentleman grants, to wit, the ingathering and conversion of the elect, shall presume to make use of these general exhortations toward the mass, he shall deserve censure as much as the man, who without divine warrant should insist on working miracles ; yea, shall be summarily condemned as an Arminian, and branded as an errorist. Here then is the proof, that what *in language* the eminent Mr. Philpot ADMITS, that also *in set terms* he DENIES ; I say the proof from this learned gentleman's own pen, that that which for the sake of appearing to occupy higher ground than that chosen by Mr. Wells he so frankly sees fit TO GRANT, *that in reality he still resolutely determines TO RECANT.* For if as by his incomprehensible theory finally asserted, these general exhortations which he had previously admitted to be ordained for the purpose of exhorting the masses and thereby gathering out the Lord's elect, are *not in reality for the purpose thus frankly admitted, but are wholly and solely for the Holy Spirit's use,* then, in the shape of general exhortations they are openly manifested, TO BE USELESS. But this is exactly that, for the predicating of which the learned Mr. Philpot had with a mingling of sarcasm condemned his opponent Wells. And thus, as has been said, while in his own departure from apostolic practice attempting to take more becoming ground than that occupied by Mr. Wells, he by virtue of the

altogether impracticable nature of the case, FALLS BACK INTO THE PRECISE POSITION OF HIS OPPONENT.

But if further and even plainer evidence on this point be required, let the reader very carefully take note. That while for the highly unjustifiable act of Mr. Wells, in presuming upon the sole warrant of human REASON to pronounce the exhortations of Jehovah's word useless, the learned Mr. Philpot righteously judges and condemns that writer, yet upon the very same insufficient warrant—his own natural REASON and that alone—does he himself, only in language even more contemptuous and indecorous still, stigmatize as altogether and utterly useless those identical passages. For speaking with immediate reference to the general exhortations he lays it down, that so long as the least lingering respect is by the heart of a gospel minister cherished for them, that minister is neither to be considered a "MAN OF TRUTH," nor to be by any member of the P. R. Baptist denomination graced with that title. Of which strange, discourteous, and highly inequitable judgment the sole explanation vouchsafed is, "*that on the strength OF THEIR OWN EXPERIENCE, all men of truth make a point of throwing overboard AS SO MUCH ARMINIAN LUMBER (that is, as something purely and utterly WORTHLESS) all general invitations and exhortations: cleaving wholly and solely (that is, in reckless disregard or contempt of the general exhortations) to the doctrines of grace.*" Can any language more effectually than this, serve to express the sentiment of disesteem? Is it possible by human phraseology more thoroughly, more contemptuously, to brand this particular portion of Jehovah's revealed truth—AS USELESS?;

In the clear light of this additional evidence let the reader now finally take note, how effectually in condemning for its rationalistic presumption the assertion of Mr. Wells, the learned censurer, as in his own despite, is by the impracticable nature of the case which he has undertaken to defend, compelled to fall back upon the very same authority—the deductions of NATURAL REASON. In the face of which fact, may the Lord grant every reflective Christian for his own immediate warning to observe, how "*Extremes meet:*" how this loudly vaunted spiritual system, collapsing beneath the weight of a too transcendental spirituality, degenerates with light occasion into the purest spirit of RATIONALISM. From these poor pages, if it may be, let the judges once for all understand, how absolutely determined Jehovah is to vindicate the pertinence of that seemingly weak and superfluous, but in its season mighty and irresistible aphorism of His servant John, to wit, "NO LIE IS OF THE TRUTH." (1 Jo. ii. 21.)

Having proved in both cases the same *rationalism*,—in both shewn the same *false decree*, to wit, that the general exhortations

of Jehovah's word ARE USELESS,—I am now in a position to gather together and as it were concentrate into a focus, the scattered rays of authority upon which in the P. R. Baptist churches is sanctioned a custom, by which the imperial mandate of the gospel is made void; the wisdom, will, and sovereign right of Jehovah inseparably connected therewith, given over to virtual scorn. *That authority, as to quantity considered, is amazingly slender; as to quality, poor as are all things human.* When gathered together and in the aggregate set forth—I challenge Satan himself to dispute it—the entire amount beams out as follows.

FIRST. Certain *isolated passages* in the writings, together with a *corresponding tendency* in the ministry of the Rev. William Huntington; a tendency, however, peculiar not to the earlier and MORE APOSTOLIC labours of that eminent servant of Christ in the vineyard, but the later and MORE DOGMATIC.

SECONDLY. A certain rash decree (*the offspring of finite and fallen human reason*) at the hand of the Rev. James Wells: to wit, that if the earnest, the very solemn exhortations which are everywhere throughout Scripture addressed to the masses (both elect and non-elect) be of an evangelical interpretation, then are they by the creature of clay to be held UTTERLY USELESS.

THIRDLY. A certain strange conception, (*equally the offspring of finite and fallen human reason*) of the Rev. Joseph Charles Philpot: to wit, that truth, all inspired truth, has been lodged in the Bible wholly and solely for the Spirit's use: hence if any man whose words cannot now be engrafted on the Bible, and who cannot feel that he speaks under immediate inspiration of God, shall presume to follow the ministerial practice of the Son of God and his inspired Apostles, he shall be held guilty of absurdity as great as that of the man, who without divine warrant insists upon WORKING MIRACLES.

The above, together with the utterly disgraceful tract by Dr. Hawker—tract deceitfully commended as “VALUABLE” and in May 1873 republished in the magazine called “Gospel Standard”—in which however, as might easily have been anticipated, the Doctor like all others who have ever attempted the unhallowed task of contravening the divine will and mandate, NEVER EVEN VENTURES TO INTRODUCE THE TRUE QUESTION AT ISSUE, is the entire authority on which in the P. R. Baptist churches is maintained that highly antisciptural system, which in God's name by this Treatise I explode. Needs there another word in demonstration of the despicable nature of that position, in support of which the sole discoverable warrant is, HUMAN FIAT VAIN AND WORTHLESS AS THIS?

PART SECOND.

THE ARGUMENT IN SUPPORT OF THE SOVEREIGN COUNSEL OF JEHOVAH UNFOLDED.

CHAPTER I.

THAT AUGMENTED RESPONSIBILITY WHICH BY VIRTUE OF THE FREE PROFFER OF THE GOSPEL ACCRUES TO THE NON-ELECT, DEMONSTRATED: AND THE SUBSTANCE OF THE DIVINE REQUIREMENTS UPON WHICH THAT RESPONSIBILITY IS DECREED TO REST, MADE UNDENIABLY MANIFEST.

IN addressing myself to the argument for the case of Jehovah, I have had many an anxious thought with regard to the matter of arrangement; the mode most effectual of exhibiting the proof of a subject, in determined antagonism to which is set forth a still further fallacious argument by those who rely on natural reason. After no small measure of reflection, I have seen fit, as the line of argument most consecutive and clear, to advance to my conclusion by the plan unfolded in the six following chapters: that is, starting with the actual fact of distinct gospel responsibility as revealed in connection with the non-elect, I shall argue the case up to the loftiest purposes of the Almighty.

The unutterably solemn subject which on the exclusive authority of Jehovah's word I am now under obligation to handle, is, the final position before the Supreme Judge of that particular portion of the human race to whom in the course of providence the gospel of Christ *has* come, but who nevertheless despise it, and are not thereby saved. In discussing the case, the argument naturally divides under three grand heads: first, the augmented responsibility which by the gospel accrues to that portion of the non-elect which has been indicated: secondly, the competency of Jehovah in strict equity to fix that responsibility: and thirdly, the all-sufficiency of the sacrifice of Christ as a righteous ground on which to conduct this evangelical purpose. Now if in unimpeachable evidence it can be proved, that there *is* with God this augmented responsibility—that there *is* with Him competency in equity to decree it—that there *is* moreover, in the sacrifice of Christ, all-sufficiency to constitute it a righteous ground for the progress of this God-glorifying purpose—then, it must at a glance be evident, that in the extraordinary presumption of despising these facts, nothing can possibly relieve the conduct of the contemptuous party from the stigma of the divine disapprobation—nothing shelter his ministry from the charge of unfaithfulness—

nothing buckler his soul from the Lord's richly merited reproach, because of pride, of disobedience, and the blackest ingratitude. Of such self-complaisant parties—pretenders to a wisdom and equity immeasurably in advance of the wisdom and equity of Deity—I am not however the judge : but only, of their present pretensions. Their ultimate judgment and award I leave to a heart and hand infinitely more scrutinizing and exact. What I am now about to write, I do indeed place on record as a swift witness against them in the great day ; but not less with temporal design to deliver from their thralldom the simple ; the weak spirits who through a too credulous belief of their inventions and misinterpretations, have been thrust aside from filial obedience, and the right ways of God.

According then to the arrangement which in treating this most momentous subject I have chosen, the work before me in the present chapter is, to establish on authority two things. First, The distinct responsibility—that is, responsibility in excess of legal responsibility—which accrues to the non-elect through the preaching in their ears of the gospel : and secondly, The actual substance of those divine requirements through contempt of which, Jehovah both charges with the sin of rejecting Christ, and imputes for that rejection guilt.

The deeply impressive fact, that under THE LAW full responsibility for sin accrues to the souls of the elect as much as the non-elect, is by the P. R. Baptist Churches everywhere admitted. For they maintain—and rightly maintain—that the sacrifice of Christ is the Lord's consummately wise scheme, through which to deliver his elect from the law's equitable sentence. On this point therefore, there arises no question : thus far, all are agreed. It is upon the point of human responsibility under THE GOSPEL, exclusively, that difference arises,—that the P. R. Baptists have taken upon them to differ from all other sections of the Christian Church : I mean all denominations holding the Head, Christ, and the doctrine of justification free, through faith in His merit and blood. For while all other denominations candidly acknowledge the responsibility in question, and in deference to the divine will cause it diligently to be preached, the P. R. Baptist Churches not only ignore its existence, but actually deny *both the ground and the warrant* for its proclamation. Which then of the contending parties is right ? Which stands in the honourable position of witness—faithful and true—to the counsel and purpose of Jehovah ?

If the deeply solemn asseverations of the Son of God be admitted to be true—or being, are by human vouchsafement to be suffered to stand—then, a second thought is not necessary in

order to settle the point at issue. Unquestionably, the P. R. Baptist Churches are wrong,—their opponents right. Hear then this all-important, this most causelessly controverted point, by the lips of Him who spake as did never man, once and for ever set at rest. Delivering on this very head the divine judgment, the Lord Jesus Christ most expressly says,—“If I had not come *and spoken* unto them, they *had not had sin*: but now have they no cloak for their sin. He that *hateth me, hateth my Father* also. If I had not *done among them* the works that none other man did, they *had not had sin*: but now have they both seen and *hated both me and my Father.*” (Jo. xv. 22—24.)

In considering this absolutely decisive passage, let the reader keep steadily in view that which has already been shewn: to wit, that the P. R. Baptist Churches do themselves unreservedly admit, that full responsibility for sin accrues to all men—elect as much as non-elect—under THE LAW. With the eye fixed upon that fact, let him now mark and lay to heart, that the holy, the just, the all glorious law as originally set up by Jehovah, was as a standard of moral rectitude *perfect*: that is, broad enough, strict enough, righteous enough, without extraneous aid of any other instrument except itself, to effect its predestined end. In plain phrase, the holy law of God did from the beginning constitute a perfect, an all-glorious rule, by which to arraign for sin, condemn for the guilt of it, and adjust for such guilt retribution. Deny this, and at a single stroke, you destroy both the glory of the law and the Lawgiver. If not therefore to the mental vision of the theologians of the P. R. Baptist Churches, yet to that of the theologians of all other denominations it will be apparent, that in order to full or perfect legal condemnation for every moral offence under itself, the law and its penalty were all-sufficient: the coming of Christ, and His speaking or preaching to men, were in nowise necessary. And wherefore? Because the divine law which in the infinite wisdom of the Almighty had been framed and set up for that purpose, was in every respect, and to the very uttermost, adapted to the required end. Now if in that perfect adaptation to its predestined end, which to the praise of the infinite wisdom of the Lawgiver was originally bestowed upon the divine law, the glory of the law and Lawgiver is to stand—is to shine forth before the moral and intellectual creation for ever—then, that law may *not* through receiving in its own predestined sphere extraneous aid from the gospel, be publicly demonstrated as too weak: but must, in the perfection of its own all sufficiency, abide single and unsupplemented throughout eternity. Hence the coming of Christ, and His speaking or preaching into the ears of men, though events having an express object with respect to the

non-elect, were never as may at a single glance be seen, designed to supplement the divine law ; and by such dishonourable supplementing, cast discredit on the nature, the absolute perfection, of that holiest and most efficient of moral institutes. Whatever therefore the purely legal condemnation of these men, or condemnation for the entire body of sin under the decalogue might have been, that exactly and no more, whether Christ had or had not come and spoken to them, it must have remained ; that exactly and no more, whether the cross of Christ had or had not been set up, it must have continued. When then it is by the Lord Jesus Christ solemnly said, "If I had not come and spoken unto them they *had not had* sin," it will, nay ! of necessity it *must* be admitted, that the signification is not that apart from his coming and speaking the persons at whom He points would not under the law have had sin—for already by all parties claiming to be evangelical it is conceded that they *would*. The fact, therefore, even by those who rely upon the deductions of natural reason must necessarily be admitted, that some special, some particular, some extraordinary sin is intended : some sin quite distinct from the great body of that sin which is under the law ; and which, as standing in immediate connection with Christ's advent in human form, and in that form speaking or preaching certain truths into the ear, is in the equity of Heaven chargeable—*necessarily and inevitably chargeable on the despisers*—by some other standard. But what other standard ? There is—there can be shown—but one : that standard is, THE GOSPEL OF THE GRACE OF GOD. The sin therefore to which in that fearfully impressive passage which I have cited the Saviour points, is evidently, nay ! can only be, SIN UNDER THE GOSPEL : to wit, that sin of hardening the heart, and stopping like a deaf adder the ear, to those exhortations, calls, commands, (call them by what name you please), which in virtue of the cross of Christ, Jehovah has placed himself in a position to address to His enemies.

Now this distinct evangelical responsibility, which upon the very weightiest asseverations of the Son of God I have incontestably established, the illustrious Mr. Philpot himself (despite his own theory and false teaching) found it impossible altogether to deny. With intellectual powers considerably in advance of the mass with whom in the course of providence he was associated—in the schools moreover to some extent sharpened in the art of enquiry—he perceived at a glance that entirely to deny human responsibility under the gospel, or at least with any hope of success deny, was in face of the truth of the New Testament a task too hard for the subtlest casuist : in plain phrase, was a downright impossibility. Because of this conviction, (notwithstanding

the false system of his adoption), he felt constrained to admit the existence of gospel responsibility of a kind—but not the real. He says, “We do not deny that man’s responsibility is increased by there being in the gospel a clearer revelation (witnessed by miracles and other evidences that are appreciable by natural men) of God’s anger against sin, according to those words, Rom. i. 18, ‘for the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men who hold the truth in unrighteousness.’” (p. 81.) Behold in this passage some slight concession in the direction of truth: concession which, in defiance of the learned gentleman’s adopted system, false teaching, and theory, is by stern necessity of the case imperiously demanded. But the passage is evasive: it concedes not the *whole* truth: no! not by a mighty hand. Let the reader if a child of God, if interested for the *whole truth* of his Maker stand by, while I strip this merely partial concession of the thin veil of plausibility which shadows it, and to the eye of the most unreflecting and ignorant, make the full measure of its theological delinquency to appear.

Mark then, that while from sheer necessity it is openly conceded, that responsibility of some kind does under the gospel accrue to the non-elect, yet that responsibility is not, as it ought to have been, acknowledged to be a distinct *gospel* responsibility apart from *legal*; a responsibility standing whole and entire upon its own basis: no; but only a certain *increase of already existing* LEGAL RESPONSIBILITY; *in short, a consummating by THE GOSPEL of responsibility imagined to remain altogether imperfect under THE LAW.* Here in the first place, have we a jumbling together or confounding of things radically distinct: things by very nature so differing and dissimilar, as steadfastly and for ever to refuse to coalesce and mingle; to wit, the law which by its nature and design, and the gospel which by its nature and design, must necessarily, each in its integrity, abide throughout eternity distinct. For the law is a perfect, an all-glorious standard of moral obligation, *all* moral obligation which apart from the gospel of life, Jehovah has seen fit to lay upon the intelligent creature: its object therefore is, that it should be to the Lord an instrument by which (under corresponding consciousness of the creature) to try, condemn, and punish the transgressor for all failure in moral obligation,—all deviation from the strict standard of rectitude. But the gospel is something which quite apart from that moral obligation which is under the law—nay! which notwithstanding the law’s most righteous condemnation for the breach of its sanction—does through the personal righteousness of the Creator bring in, and to the guilty conscience of the non-elect creature submit, a free proffer of clemency and life. Such proffer having, as in a subse-

quent chapter I shall very effectually prove, for its lofty, its all-important end, *to magnify under the severest phase of His fearful equity the Lawgiver, and stop the mouth of every misjudging rationalistic creature.* These two all-glorious emanations of the Divine Mind then, both are, and must eternally abide, **DISTINCT.** Hence to every one capable of discriminating it will be evident, that if for failure in this or that particular head of moral obligation under the law, there be in any conceivable sense at the hand of the Lawgiver judgment and retribution, it can consistently *only* be, consequently by righteous necessity must and *shall* be, according to that perfect standard of moral obligation which has by Himself been set up in **THE LAW.** On the other hand, it is equally clear and evident, that if for some distinct act—*some act which is not under the law, which BY NO POSSIBILITY CAN TRANSPIRE UNDER THE LAW, but which by very nature of the immutable law is from the legal dispensation altogether and utterly excluded—to wit, THE DESPISING BY THE CONDEMNED LAW-BREAKER OF A FREE PROFFER OF LIFE AT THE HAND OF GOD*—there be in any conceivable sense judgment and retribution, it can consistently *only* be, hence by righteous necessity must and *shall* be, quite apart from that ordinary standard of moral obligation called **THE LAW;** and according to its own proper and peculiar rule, to wit, the intrinsic rectitude or equity of the Gospel-giver: as it is written,—“In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by **JESUS CHRIST according to my gospel.**” (Rom. ii. 16.) Here then at the hand of the learned Mr. Philpot is proved, the jumbling together or confounding of *that* responsibility for moral delinquency which is under the law, and that *other* responsibility which is foreign—even that which by no conceivable possibility can transpire under the law—but which by very nature of the law, that is, its eternal immutability, is from the legal dispensation of necessity and **FOR EVER EXCLUDED.** Now this, if described in the language of the schools, is what is termed **FALSE THEOLOGY.**

But secondly, in order to give some kind of colour to this absurd, this absolutely impossible conceit of increased *legal* responsibility through means of the *gospel*, it is by Mr. Philpot affirmed, that it accrues through “*there being in the gospel a clearer revelation of God’s ANGER AGAINST SIN.*” Here again to unpractised and ignorant readers is a very plausible reason advanced, to explain that increased *legal* responsibility which has been supposed to result from *the gospel.* But although by Mr. Philpot himself, the whole band of his ministerial brethren likewise such reason may be deemed satisfactory, yet is it directly opposed to that damnnatory truth, which in explanation of the augmented or evangelical responsibility of the non-elect, has by the Lord Jesus

Christ been expressly declared. For according to the showing of the Incarnate Deity, that responsibility is not for any sin which is possible under the law, but for impenitent *hate* of Himself; hate also of the Eternal Father in Him; a hatred of Himself and the Father, be it specially noted, IN SUCH CHARACTER AS COULD NEVER IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE TENOR OF THE LAW HAVE BEEN ASSUMED. Listen to his own words: "If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin: but now have they no cloak for their sin. *He that HATETH me HATETH my Father also.* If I had not done among them the works which none other man did, they had not had sin: but now have they both *seen and HATED both me and my Father.*" In considering these words let the reader be pleased to observe, that in the two express and most significant clauses with respect to human hate, of which one is appended to each separate declaration of sin and augmented responsibility, the nature of that hate is necessarily to be determined by *the character* in which the Son of God appeared before the parties concerned, and the nature of those special truths which he preached into their ears. I ask therefore, first, Did the Son of God on this occasion or any other, appear before the parties whom he thus sternly condemns in the character of a Lawgiver, or did He at this time and always stand before them in the capacity of a Gospel-giver? And secondly, Was the truth which he proclaimed in their ears the substance of the moral law, or was it at all times the very essence of the glorious gospel? If Christ came in the character of a Lawgiver, and preached to those against whom he bears witness the law, then, unquestionably, the hate which they manifested was sin under the law. And contrariwise, if Christ appeared before them in the character of a Gospel-giver, and preached to them only the pure gospel, then, indisputably, the gratuitous hate of these parties was sin, which could by no possibility transpire under the law, *but must necessarily be under the gospel.* It follows, that the augmented responsibility to which in connexion with such sin the Lord Jesus Christ bears witness, would certainly be augmented responsibility FOR DISREGARD AND CONTEMPT OF THE GOSPEL. With reference therefore to the character in which he came, and nature of the word or message which he preached, what be it asked says the Son of God himself? Once more, let his own lips attest. With reference to his incarnation and mission upon earth, he says,—“For God sent not his Son into the world to *condemn* the world; but that the world through him might *be saved.*” And with respect to the substance of his preaching he affirms,—“The words that I speak unto you, *they are spirit, and they are life*: but there are some of you that *believe not.*” From these solemn, these very plain asseverations it

is incontrovertibly established, that the Son of God's appearance in the flesh was not in the character of a Lawgiver, but Gospel-giver; and that the substance of His public testimony was not law, but the very essence of the gospel. The hatred therefore to which with such significance He here points, was hatred of the Gospel-giver and His gospel testimony: and by consequence, the augmented responsibility of which he so solemnly speaks, was augmented responsibility NOT UNDER THE LAW, but under its own peculiar standard, to wit, THE INTRINSIC EQUITY, THE ETERNAL RECTITUDE OF THE GOSPEL-GIVER.

That this great fact may shine forth in a more conspicuous manner still, let the reader be pleased to regard that singularly pointed reference to the ancient prophecy predicting this hate, with which the Lord Jesus is pleased to close His special testimony. He says, "But this cometh to pass (that is, my appearing before them in the flesh—preaching into their ears the gospel of life—backing the testimony with those mighty works which none other man ever did—together with their gratuitous rejection of all) that the word might be fulfilled that is written in their law, THEY HATED ME WITHOUT A CAUSE." Of which assertion be it observed the real significance is, That whereas by the holy, the just, the immutable law of God, the ordinary moral delinquency of these parties was already to the uttermost made manifest and condemned, which legal condemnation had there been no gospel submitted to them might have seemed, ay! might even have been urged as a reasonable cause for hate, yet the free proffer of the gospel coming between altogether plucks out of their hand that cloak or cover for their sin, and leaves them absolutely destitute of excuse. For the gospel, without detriment to the authority, rectitude, majesty, or in a single word glory of the law, but by a way which covers the law with glory more transcendent, lays down in the presence of those legally condemned parties a free proffer of life by Christ: thus cutting off every shadow of plea for enmity, stripping away all excuse which on the ground of the law's condemnation might have been urged, and leaving despisers of the gospel absolutely denuded of cloak or covering for that malignancy of spirit, through which they causelessly hate both the Son and the Father. Hence this express reference by Christ to the ancient prophecy; hence his infallible testimony in connection therewith. Mark the words: "If I had NOT come and spoken UNTO THEM" (*that is, had not as the sacrificial victim for sin appeared in the flesh—had not preached to them the pure gospel of life*) "they had not had augmented or gospel sin: if I had NOT done AMONG THEM the works which none other man did" (*that is, by the works of Deity sealed to them the divinity*

of my mission and preaching) "they had not had augmented or evangelical sin: but now by my coming in the flesh, now by my speaking Jehovah's proffer of mercy into their very ears, *they have in me and my mission ACTUALLY SEEN the Father; yea, have without a cause HATED both Him and Me.* Thus are they in the gratuitous nature of this guilt made manifest; for in them is the ancient prophecy recorded in the Scriptures fulfilled, 'THEY HATED ME WITHOUT A CAUSE.'"

I have now irrefragably demonstrated the grand fact, that the augmented guilt and responsibility to which the Lord Jesus Christ bears witness, is not, as by the learned Mr. Philpot affirmed, "because there is in the gospel a clearer revelation of God's anger against sin" 'that is, ordinary sin, any sin, sin under the law'; but is because of UNBELIEF; *unbelief* in full view of that gospel which the Son of God himself preached; *unbelief* through aversion to the Father and the Son, notwithstanding a free proffer of life brought in by the way of blood. I therefore publicly charge upon this further theological error of the accomplished Mr. Philpot, to wit, of augmented LEGAL RESPONSIBILITY *through the instrumentality of THE GOSPEL*, not merely that it stultifies the law and the Law-giver, but that in equal degree it dishonours the gospel and Gospel-giver. But to the proof.

Let the reader mark, That because of a supposed imperfect manifestation of sin, and consequent SHORT MEASURE of creature responsibility under THE DIVINE LAW, therefore (for so concludes Mr. Philpot), the need of a more perfect manifestation of sin, and consequent FULL MEASURE of creature responsibility by means of THE GOSPEL. Here, then, in the execution of its office, is an altogether insufficient law, supplemented, patched up, eked out by the gospel: to the end, *that the purpose for which in the divine wisdom that law was originally ordained, might at length on the supporting shoulders of the gospel BE BLUNDERED into inglorious fulfilment.* So much for the theological accuracy on this head of the illustrious Mr. Philpot. As far therefore as the law is concerned, the spectacle here exhibited is, it will be admitted, not of the comeliest—the most dignified kind. While in the imperfection of His law, the Lawgiver is openly degraded.

But to turn now from that grave fact, be it next carefully noted, that the august Being devising and promulgating the law, or Lawgiver, is the very same devising and promulgating the gospel, or Gospel-giver. The scheme of the law then, and that of the gospel, issuing from the same glorious Person, it was essential, if that Person was not to be degraded, that these two exalted emanations of His infinite mind should not witness to the absence of perfection in the wisdom of their Divine Author—but its pre-

sence. In order however to this desirable consummation it was indispensable, that the law as originally constituted should be perfectly adapted—entirely adequate—to its own peculiar end; that all occasion for ridicule might be cut off. And for the same cause, that the gospel as originally devised, should be devised with due respect toward the perfection of the law; lest by any means the perfection of that law should be compromised. But when instead of this simple wisdom in connection with the law and gospel it is found, *that that perfect condemnation of sin to effect which the law was expressly ordained, is only ultimately blundered into existence by the law-supplementing instrumentality of the gospel*, then, since the Gospel-giver is the very same august Person that gave the law, it is clear, that this divine Gospel-giver, through appointing the glory of the gospel to make manifest the utter absence of glory in the law—and as an infallible consequence the absence of glory in the wisdom and understanding of the Lawgiver—has by incompetency thus gross, thus inexcusable, absolutely degraded the Divine Majesty. In short, if Mr. Philpot's opinions be just, it is certain, that the deviser of the gospel, or Gospel-giver, has eternally and very grievously stultified Himself!

It may now perhaps be seen, how exceedingly dangerous is the ground upon which the foot of natural reason treads, when in touching realities sublimely momentous as the purposes and ordinances of Jehovah, she forsakes the sure testimony of the inspired Word, to rely upon her own crude and shallow deductions. Should the reader at this point be disposed to inquire, why, in the case of the non-elect, a divine acute and clear-sighted as Mr. Philpot should desire to evade this recognition of full and distinct responsibility under the gospel, let him know, first, That if of a truth there be such responsibility for the non-elect, it can only be by virtue of *a real gospel preached to them*; and secondly, that if a real gospel be preached to them, this can in equity only be done upon *a righteous ground*; and thirdly, that save only the grand *Work of Christ*, there is throughout the wide universe of God no such righteous ground to be found. To have conceded the distinct, the full gospel responsibility of the non-elect, therefore, would have sacrificed the whole antisciptural position for which this illustrious man deemed it wise to contend. Hence the concession of gospel responsibility of a kind—BUT NOT THE REAL.

From the Holy Scriptures I have now abundantly demonstrated, first, The absolute necessity of admitting altogether separate and distinct from the condemnation of the Law, a full and particular condemnation by the Gospel: and, secondly, That anything short of such admission, must infallibly subvert the glory of the law and Lawgiver; nay! bear equally fatally on that of the gospel and

Gospel-giver. Upon the strength therefore of the impregnable argumentation above recorded, I am constrained to hold this *merely partial recognition* by Mr. Philpot of the gospel responsibility of the non-elect, as a direct evasion of that more full, more weighty truth concerning hate and the responsibility of hate, which for the warning of the wicked has by the finger of God been recorded in the New Testament. The responsibility admitted by this highly distinguished gentleman is, *a concession indeed in the direction of truth, yet not by a mighty hand* THE WHOLE TRUTH.

But does this grand fact of *human responsibility under the gospel*, stand exclusively on the testimony of that single passage, which from the closing discourse of the Son of God with His disciples I have chosen for my opening demonstration? It most certainly does not. It is made equally manifest by that fearful denunciation against unbelief, to wit, "*He that believeth not shall be damned,*" which Christ has seen fit to append to his just command that the gospel be preached to every creature. Ay! and not from that denunciation only, but from every other passage in which expressed or implied is contained the divine disapprobation of unbelief. Now these passages are many: I have but sufficient space to gather up a few of the chief. It is written,—"*He that believeth not* is condemned already, because he hath *not believed* in the name of the only begotten Son of God." (Jo. iii. 18.) Again,—"*And he that believeth not* the Son shall not see life; but the wrath of God abideth on him." (Jo. iii. 36.) Yet again,—"*I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins: for if ye believe not that that I am he, ye shall die in your sins.*" (Jo. viii. 24.) And yet again,—"*He that believeth not God* hath made him a liar; because he *believeth not* the record that God gave of His Son." (Jo. v. 10.) And yet again,—"*He that believeth not* shall be damned." (Mark xvi. 16.) Here then are five passages the immediate and express reference of which is to the sin of UNBELIEF. In the first is shewn, the impossibility that condemnation should be removed UNDER UNBELIEF: in the second, the exclusion of the gift of life, and acquisition of divine wrath BECAUSE OF UNBELIEF: in the third, the certainty of dying in unpardoned sin, AS A RESULT OF UNBELIEF: in the fourth, the insult which through the record revealed as a ground of faith in Christ, accrues to Jehovah BY UNBELIEF: in the fifth, damnation in the sense of death added to death as THE JUST MEED OF UNBELIEF. These several statements with respect to unbelief, to which a multitude more might be added, indisputably substantiate the facts, first, that there *is sin* in this particular state of soul; and secondly, that in consequence of such sin, it is a state of mind in the highest degree offensive to God. For without sin, it could *not* be an offence; and if not an

offence, it would be an act of folly, nay ! madness thus publicly to denounce it. I lay it down, therefore, that as God judges, *there is in this false state of mind, both guilt and deep offence.*

But in order to the existence of sin and offence in that particular state of mind indicated, there must positively be, first, a something by God proposed to the mind for credence, which through His free submission of it constitutes an actual ground of faith ; and secondly, that something which has as a ground of faith by God been proposed to the mind, must be so intrinsically worthy of credit as to give it an absolute and paramount claim to be believed. For were there nothing to be believed, then, under such circumstance, *it would be simple rectitude to believe nothing.* And again, even if something were proposed for human belief which had no just claim to be believed, then, in the case of its *not* being believed, *there could be no righteous ground upon which either to entertain offence, or impute guilt.* Be it asked, therefore, is there in His holy name anything by God proposed to the minds of the non-elect for their belief ? and if so, Is that which has been proposed altogether and entirely worthy to be by the creature believed ? Unless we be prepared to regard Jehovah as the most untrustworthy and deceitful of beings, the answers on the evidence of His word to these questions are, first, *There is something to be believed ;* and secondly, *That which is to be believed is, the gospel of the grace of God : as it is written,—“ Go ye into all the world and preach THE GOSPEL to every creature : he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, and he that believeth not (THAT IS, THIS GOSPEL) shall be damned.”* Since then the thing submitted for belief is the gospel, and since that gospel has so unchallengable a right to be believed, that the unbelief of the non-elect forms a just ground for the Divine Being both to entertain offence and impute guilt, it is evident, that this guilt being such as can by no possibility transpire under the law, the obligation of judging its demerit, and appointing its just retribution—in other words, *of adding on account of it righteous CONDEMNATION TO THAT CONDEMNATION WHICH IS DUE UNDER THE LAW, must devolve on the Gospel-giver alone.*

But to leave now this fearful fact of the augmented responsibility of the non-elect under the gospel, the next part of my duty in this chapter is, to make manifest the full substance of those express REQUIREMENTS of Jehovah, on which this augmented responsibility of the non elect is decreed to rest.

Once more then pointing to the decisive teaching already cited, I call upon the reader to mark, that the Lord Jesus Christ expressly asserts as truth—truth destined to recur again in the judgment—that if he had *not* come in the flesh, had *not* spoken to the

despisers, had *not* wrought before their very eyes the works of Deity, they had not under the gospel been chargeable with sin. Since therefore the whole condemnation here unfolded hinges upon the coming of the Son of God in the flesh, and His speaking, that is, delivering certain testimony in the ears of these non-elect parties, it is next in connexion with this remarkable declaration absolutely indispensable to inquire, What the entire substance of that testimony was, to which, when with the fearful solemnity of His own final decisions in the day of judgment full in view He expressly pointed, saying,—“If I had not come and spoken unto them, they had not had sin: but now they have no cloak for their sin.”

With design on indisputable evidence to establish this point, I revert to the divine record with respect to the very first appearance of the Son of God as a public preacher on earth, and there, in the early pages of the gospel by Matthew I find it written,—“From that time Jesus began *to preach, and to say*, REPENT: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.” (iv. 17.) Again in Mark,—“Now after that John was cast into prison, Jesus came into Galilee *preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying*, The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is at hand: REPENT YE.” (i. 14, 15.) Yet again,—“Jesus answering said unto them, They that are whole need not a physician, but they that are sick. *I came not to call the righteous, but sinners TO REPENTANCE.*” (Luke v. 31, 32.) And yet again,—“There were present at that season some that told him of the Galilæans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices. And Jesus answering said unto them, Suppose ye that these Galilæans were sinners above all the Galilæans, because they suffered such things? I tell you, Nay: *but except YE REPENT, ye shall all likewise perish.*” (Luke xiii. 1—5.) And once more,—“Then began he to upbraid the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done, *because they REPENTED NOT*, saying, Woe unto you, for it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon,—yea, more tolerable even for Sodom itself, *than for you.*” (Matt. xi. 20—24.) In connection with the above passages, let the reader hear and note that declaration of Jehovah’s will and purpose made by the Son of God after His resurrection, *and at the very moment in which he bestowed upon the Apostles A SPIRITUAL UNDERSTANDING, by which to comprehend the Scriptures.* It is written,—“Then opened He their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures. And said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: *and that REPENTANCE and remission of sins should BE PREACHED in his name among ALL NATIONS, beginning at Jerusalem.*” (Luke xxiv. 45—47.) From the above passages, and

many others of similar character we can have no doubt, that of the things by the Son of God spoken to those despisers who were left without cloak for their sin, the leading, or foremost matter was, *repentance toward God*. Nor this alone; but that in default thereof, a weightier sentence, a superadded gospel condemnation awaited them: some doom which would render their state worse than that which by sentence of the law should become the portion of the inhabitants of Tyre, of Sidon, and of Sodom. Thus much, at least, against all who heard the gospel preaching at His lips—saw the evidence of its divine character in His mighty works—yet repented not—did Christ indisputably preach. That very Christ, mark, of whom it is written,—“Him hath God exalted with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to *give repentance to Israel*, and forgiveness of sins.” (Acts v. 31.)

But with the faithful record of the New Testament before him will any one venture to affirm, that repentance was the only requirement in order to salvation which was by the Son of God preached? Does not the page of inspiration with equal clearness give us to understand, that, in addition to the preaching of repentance, the Lord of glory called every soul that by remission of sin or free justification would escape everlasting damnation, to believe or have faith in Himself? Did He not preach, “The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of heaven is at hand: *repent ye, AND BELIEVE THE GOSPEL?*” (Mark i. 14, 15.) Here beyond controversy is the evidence that over and above His preaching of repentance the Son of God added the imperative summons *to faith in Himself for the free remission of sin*.

But glance now in passing at the whole tenor of his teaching, as found pervading and absolutely saturating the pages of the blessed gospel by John. It is written,—“Then said they unto him, What shall we do that we might work the works of God? Jesus answered and said unto them, *This is the work of God, that YE BELIEVE on him whom he hath sent.*” (Jo. vi. 28, 29.) Again,—“And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, *and BELIEVETH ON HIM, may have everlasting life*, and I will raise him up at the last day.” (Jo. vi. 40.) Again,—“Verily, verily, I say unto you, *he that BELIEVETH ON ME hath everlasting life.*” (vi. 47.) Again,—“Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, *and BELIEVETH ON HIM THAT SENT ME, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life.*” (Jo. v. 24.) Again,—“In the last day, that great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. *He that BELIEVETH ON ME, as the Scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.* But this spake he of the Spirit, which they

THAT BELIEVE ON HIM *should receive.*" (Jo. vii. 37—39.) And yet again,—“For God so loved the world, that He gave his only begotten Son, *that whosoever BELIEVETH ON HIM should not perish, but have everlasting life.*” (Jo. iii. 16.) The above passages scattered throughout many separate discourses of the Son of God, do, it must be admitted, set forth the exact character of His ministry to the souls of the unregenerate masses.

I have now sketched out the grand heads of the preaching of Christ; or heads of that evangelical call, which for the intellectual instruction of the ignorant formed the daily, the continual burden of His ministry. However much therefore the advocates of a false system may hate or seek to evade it, yet from the page of inspiration—THAT UNERRING PAGE—it is evident, that if language is capable of intelligently expressing anything, then, the language of the New Testament certainly sets forth this, That the Lord Jesus Christ spent the whole period of His public labour on earth, in journeying from city to village, and from village to city, *testifying to the guilty children of men, REPENTANCE TOWARD GOD, and FAITH IN HIS ONLY BEGOTTEN SON.*

With this decisive evidence before us, it is an absolute impossibility that any unprejudiced party should for a moment be able to suspect, that either the immediate forerunner of Christ, the Baptist, or the successors of Christ, the inspired Apostles, should have been led to deviate from the teaching and truth of their Lord. But since in the present dispute, I have in a vast number of cases to do with minds through an opposite teaching warped and deeply prejudiced, I shall here devote a few pages to the work of gathering together the leading passages of the Word, illustrative of the substance of apostolic preaching.

First, with respect to the ministry of the Baptist,—the instrument by the Spirit of God sanctified to discern and declare the Messiah. Of that man, by Christ himself denominated chief of prophets, it is unmistakably written,—“In those days came John the Baptist in the wilderness of Judæa, *and saying, REPENT YE: for the kingdom of heaven (or gospel kingdom) is at hand.*” And again,—“O generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come? *Bring forth therefore fruits meet for REPENTANCE.*” (Matt. iii. 1, 2, 7, 8.) So much for the ministry of John with regard to repentance: but what of faith? This,—“I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: *but He that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear: He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire.*” In connection with this latter passage, the Scripture itself by the inspired lips of Paul furnishes the following plain interpretation: “And he (Paul) said unto them (certain disciples whom he had found), Unto what

an were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John's baptism. men said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of *repentance*, saying unto the people, *that THEY SHOULD BELIEVE on Him which should come after him, that is, ON CHRIST JESUS.*" (Acts ix. 1, 4.) So much for the ministry of John with regard to faith.

But what of the ministry of the leading Apostle among the twelve, Peter? Of this man, in some sense distinguished above the other inspired Apostles, it is written,—“Then Peter said unto *them*, REPENT, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the Holy Ghost.” (Acts ii. 38.) And again,—“REPENT YE *therefore*, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord.” (Acts iii. 19.) And yet again,—“REPENT *therefore of this thy wickedness*, and pray God, if perhaps the thought of thine heart may be forgiven thee.” (Acts vii. 22.) So much for the matter of repentance: but what concerning faith? This: “And He (Christ) commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is He which was ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead. To Him give all the prophets witness, *that through His name, WHOSOEVER BELIEVETH IN HIM shall receive remission of sins.*” (Acts i. 42, 43.) So much, as far as testimony with respect to faith is concerned,—so much, I say, for the ministry of Peter. On either point, repentance on the one hand, faith on the other, it will be seen to be identical with the ministry of the Baptist, and that of the Lord Jesus Christ.

But what of the ministry of the apostle Philip? Though the record with regard to it is but scanty, yet it is sufficient to establish the very same facts. It is written,—“Therefore they who were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the word. Then Philip went down to the city of Samaria, and PREACHED CHRIST unto them.” (Acts viii. 4, 5.) Again,—“Then Philip opened his mouth and began at the same scripture, and preached unto him JESUS. And as they went on their way, they came to a certain water: and the eunuch said, See, here is water; doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, *If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest.* And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God (Acts viii. 27—37.) Though the record concerning this apostle is in rather to mark the acts which he did than the truths he preached, yet it is plain, that when it is affirmed of his preaching that it was “*the preaching OF CHRIST unto men,*” and to this in particular, “*the preaching OF JESUS,*” it is by these expressions clearly implied, that his teaching was in accordance with that of the Master, the Baptist, and Peter.

With regard to the public testimony of the remaining Apostles of the twelve, it must be admitted, that the record is very brief. Nevertheless, taken in connexion with the fact, that it was given by the same inspiring Spirit that dwelt in the Humanity of Christ, in the Baptist, and in Peter, it is all-sufficient to establish the same thing. It is written,—“And as *they* spake unto *the people*, the priests, and the captain of the temple, and the Sadducees, came upon them. Being grieved that *they taught the people*, AND PREACHED THROUGH JESUS *the resurrection from the dead*.” (Acts iv. 1, 2.) Again,—“And *they* (the Apostles) departed from the presence of the council, rejoicing that they were counted worthy to suffer shame for his (*Christ's*) name. And *daily in the temple, and in every house, they ceased not TO TEACH AND PREACH JESUS CHRIST*.” (Acts v. 41, 42.) Now this general and indiscriminate procedure on the part of these men, be it observed, was under express injunction of the Holy Ghost. For in the same context it is written,—“But the angel of the Lord by night opened the prison doors, and brought them forth, and said, *Go, stand and SPEAK in the temple TO THE PEOPLE all the words of THIS LIFE*.” (Acts v. 18, 19.) The remainder of the twelve therefore, it is evident, were as to testimony fully agreed with Philip, Peter, the Baptist, and the Lord Jesus Christ.

The last inspired Agent of whose public ministry we have any record, though *not* of the Twelve, is nevertheless the most distinguished of all Jehovah's human and inspired instruments; I mean, the great Apostle of the Gentiles—the matchless PAUL. By reason of the importance of this man's office, the record with regard to his public ministry is more full. I earnestly desire, therefore, that from his own solemn statement as delivered in the presence of Agrippa, the reader should be put in possession not merely of the substance of his public preaching, but also his divinely imposed commission. With regard to the latter, the record runs thus :—“I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to *make thee a minister and a witness* both of those things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee; *delivering thee from THE PEOPLE, and from THE GENTILES (that is, persecutors), UNTO WHOM now I send thee, TO OPEN THEIR EYES, and to turn them from DARKNESS TO LIGHT, and from the POWER OF SATAN (Are these saints?) to God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified BY FAITH THAT IS IN ME*.” (Acts xxvi. 16—18.) Such the divinely imposed commission, which, unless Paul have lied, that giant in Israel received from the Son of God.

But leaving now the sublime commission of this noblest of Christian ministers, let the reader next hear his own true and

faithful statement, as to how he through immediate inspiration of the Holy Ghost, ay! and to his dying day, carried out the divine purpose. He says,—“Whereupon, O king Agrippa, I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision: *but shewed first unto them of Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judea, and then to the Gentiles, that they should REPENT AND TURN TO GOD, and do works meet for REPENTANCE.*” (Acts xxvi. 19, 20.) And again,—“Then Paul stood in the midst of Mars hill, and said, Ye men of Athens, I perceive that in all things ye are too superstitious” (Were these saints?). . . . “And the times of this ignorance God winked at; *but now COMMANDETH all men everywhere TO REPENT.*” (Acts xvii. 22, 30.)

So much for the public testimony of Paul in the matter of repentance: but what of faith? This: “Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man (Christ) is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: and *by him ALL THAT BELIEVE are justified from all things*, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses.” (Acts xiii. 38, 39.) Again,—“And they said” (viz., Paul and Silas to the jailor of Philippi), “*BELIEVE ON THE LORD JESUS CHRIST, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house.*” (Acts xvi. 31.) So much for the testimony of the great Apostle with regard to faith. But that the reader may the more accurately judge of what God esteems true gospel preaching among the Gentiles, let him hear Paul’s more combined testimony, as by his own faithful lips witnessed on that deeply touching occasion, his farewell meeting with the elders of the Church of Ephesus. It is written,—“Ye know from the first day that I came into Asia, after what manner I have been with you at all seasons . . . and how I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you, but have showed you, and have taught you publicly, and from house to house, *testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks*, REPENTANCE TOWARD GOD, AND FAITH TOWARD OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.” (Acts xx. 18—21.)

But this witness goes further: by inspiration of the Spirit, and with a view to instigate to spiritual zeal in Zion, he declares in connexion with his personal ministration what to his dying day was the exalted ambition, the inextinguishable, the holy desire of his renewed soul. He that hath circumcised ear to hear, let him hear what the Spirit by his servant Paul saith unto the Churches. It runs thus,—“For I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ hath not wrought by me, to make *the Gentiles* obedient, by word and deed. Through mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God; *so that from Jerusalem, and round about into Illyricum, I have FULLY PREACHED THE GOSPEL OF CHRIST.* Yea, so have I strived to

preach the gospel, NOT WHERE CHRIST WAS NAMED, lest I should build upon another man's foundation : but as it is written, To WHOM HE WAS NOT SPOKEN OF, they shall see : and THEY THAT HAVE NOT HEARD shall understand." (Rom. xv. 18—21.) In full view of this glorious testimony, I appeal to the mind most inveterately prejudiced against apostolic preaching, to wit, the indiscriminate preaching of Christ to the perishing, and I say, Is there not here something at diametrical antagonism with that rule for the ministry, which has in the P. R. Baptist Churches been set up? And if there be, then, is not the Saviour's reproach which necessarily follows, awfully pertinent, solemn, noteworthy, viz., "THUS DO YE BY YOUR TRADITIONS MAKE THE WORD OF GOD OF NONE EFFECT"? (Matt. xv. 6—9.)

Lastly, in connexion with this faithful deference to the divine will, this indiscriminate testifying of the blood of Christ to unregenerate Jew and Gentile, I wish it most particularly to be observed, that in the very same address to the elders of the Church of Ephesus from which I have already quoted, the Apostle with special reference to this indiscriminate procedure on his part, exalts it as a testifying of the GOSPEL OF THE GRACE OF GOD in such wise as to finish his course with joy. Hear him : he says,—“But none of these things move me, neither count I my life dear unto myself, so that I might finish my course with joy, and THE MINISTRY which I have received of the Lord Jesus, TO TESTIFY THE GOSPEL OF THE GRACE OF GOD.” (Acts xx. 24.) So much for the gospel ministry of that mightiest of all labourers in the vineyard of Christ—the peerless Apostle of the Gentiles. With his unchallengeable testimony, I conclude this brief sketch of the substance of inspired preaching, as discernible in the life and labours of the Son of God and all his elect Apostles.

But I will not pass from my notice of this exalted servant of Christ, until I first (to the praise of the glory of the divine power, the magnifying of the Spirit's operation and grace in the human heart) set forth the deep feeling, the tender compassion, the self-sacrificing devotion with which this prince of gospel labourers carried out his Master's command. How different from the coarse, stony, brutal spirit of many, who under the blinding influence of a wisdom wiser than God, strain Calvinistic doctrine, and to the continual hardening of their own heart pervert the right ways of God. Listen to the very chiefest of the Apostles of God, as he here gives posterity a door of access into the deepest recess of his noble heart. He says,—“For though I be free from all men, yet have I made myself servant unto all, that I might gain the more. And unto the Jews I became as a Jew,

that I might gain the Jews ; to them that are under the law, as under the law, that I might gain them that are under the law ; to them that are without law, as without law, (being not without law to God, but under the law to Christ), that I might gain them that are without law. To the weak I became as weak, *that I might gain the weak : I am made all things to all men, that I might by all means save some.*" (1 Cor. ix. 19—22.) And again,—"*Brethren, my heart's desire and prayer to God for Israel is, that they might be saved.*" (Rom. x. 1.) And yet again, and stronger still,—"*I say the truth in Christ, I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the Holy Ghost, that I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart. For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the flesh.*" (Rom. ix. 1—3.) Such the spirit and feeling, which through the Divine Sanctifier dwelt in the bosom of Paul : how infinitely more noble than that of multitudes who affect his doctrines.

But pushing enquiry still further, that is, beyond the record witnessing the substance of inspired preaching, I discover, that not long after the Saviour's ascension it came to pass as follows. "And at that time there was a great persecution against the church which was at Jerusalem, and they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judæa and Samaria, except the apostles. Therefore they which were scattered abroad *went everywhere preaching THE WORD.*" (Acts viii. 1—4.) Of which preaching, and its great and glorious effect, it is written,—"*Now they which were scattered abroad upon the persecution that arose about Stephen travelled as far as Phenice, and Cyprus, and Antioch, preaching the word to none but unto the Jews only. And some of them were men of Cyprus and Cyrene, which, when they were come to Antioch, spake unto the Grecians, preaching the Lord Jesus.* And the hand of the Lord was with them : and a great number believed, and turned unto the Lord." (Acts xi. 19—21.) What then have we here? I reply, first, a vast mass of human beings in a state of unregeneracy, to wit, unconverted men—graceless men—sinners : secondly, the broad fact that Jehovah will not deal with that huge mass of corruption, sin, and death, so long as the Lord Jesus is *not ministered* to them : thirdly, that certain preachers of the gospel, drawing the bow at a venture, not knowing what the effect was to be, deviated from the practice of preaching to the Jews only, and laid the testimony of the gospel (repentance and faith) before that perishing mass : and fourthly, that this procedure on their part was so thoroughly pleasing in the sight of God, that He backed it with the outpouring of the Holy Ghost, and a great number of these Gentile hearers (but not all) were effectually turned to Christ.

In connexion with the graceless and unregenerate, I have now set forth what was the true burden of apostolic teaching. Upon the strength of this plain scriptural evidence therefore, I am entitled in a manner the most unqualified to lay it down, *That the preaching of repentance toward God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, DOES, in the case of the unconverted masses, constitute a PURE, NAY ! THE ONLY PURE AND SOUND GOSPEL MINISTRY ;* or at least, *did, in connexion with similar parties, constitute such a ministry in the apostolic day.* Now this being the case, therefore, of every rationalistic gainsayer, I take leave to demand, Is the case of the gospel at all affected by the lapse of time—is it changed? There are indeed ungodly parties, who in their zeal to render the Bible nugatory reply, “Yea.” They give us to understand, that the world, or society, has so advanced in education, refinement, delicacy of the moral sense, et cætera, that the Word of God in its ancient form has become unsuitable ; needs to be remodelled ; adapted and adjusted to modern feeling. But despite the advanced state of society in general, the refined and delicate moral sense of these judges in particular, the uncompromising Son of God it is evident thinks very differently : for thus saith that Holy One,—“Go ye into all the world and *preach THIS GOSPEL (not another) to every creature : and lo, I am with you alway, EVEN UNTO THE END OF THE WORLD.*” But if from the apostolic day to the end of Time the case of the gospel does not change, it is equally certain that the case of man does not. For despite education, refinement, and this boasted delicacy of the moral sense, he still contrives to furnish abundant evidence to the fact, that he is conceived in sin, shapen in iniquity. Hence if ever he is to escape the damnation of hell, it must be by the way preached of old by Paul, the original way of the gospel ; to wit, BY REPENTANCE TOWARD GOD, AND FAITH IN OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.

I have now abundantly accomplished *that*, to which at the outset of this chapter I had pledged myself. That is, upon evidence altogether incontrovertible I have established, First, the distinct responsibility of the non-elect in the sight of God for an offence—a particular sin—WHICH CAN BY NO POSSIBILITY TRANSPIRE UNDER THE LAW : viz., *gratuitous hate of the Gospel-giver, and virtual rejection through unbelief of His gospel.* Secondly, by exhibition of the most striking passages on record relative to the public ministry of the Lord Jesus Christ, the Baptist, the twelve Apostles, and great Apostle of the Gentiles, I have, beyond the possibility of contradiction shewn, the true substance of those divine or gospel requirements in default of obedience to which, the Gospel-giver deems it just both to charge with the sin of *rejecting Christ, and impute for that rejection guilt.* As far therefore

as this particular head of the case for Jehovah is concerned, I might well have considered it settled—might at this point with all safety have closed the evidence. But since it cannot fail to prove both interesting and instructive, to trace the exact light in which that general preaching which He has commanded is by Jehovah himself regarded, I have judged it wise to invite the attention of the reader to that choice piece of allegorical teaching at the lips of Christ, which we are accustomed to designate the parable of the marriage feast. From which, on mature reflection it must be admitted, that because of the spirit of His intent in the gospel, the Lord regards the proclamation of His call to repentance and faith in the light of a positive invitation: the conduct of His enemies in despising it, as tantamount to an absolute REJECTION OF THE DIVINE CLEMENCY.

The opening announcement of the Divine Speaker is, that the parable is put forth as a lively illustration of actual facts in connexion with "the kingdom of heaven." This expression, "kingdom of heaven," is one which is by the Lord Jesus Christ and his Apostles expressly applied to the professing Christian Church—that kingdom in which the Eternal Father is acknowledged in the Son—*kingdom which by means of the gospel, Jehovah has established on earth.* Once or twice indeed, the same expression is applied to the abode of saints, the realm of glory, but these are exceptions to the rule; the general reference being to the kingdom of God below. When therefore it is by Christ said, "that the kingdom of heaven is like to a certain king which made a marriage for his son," it is evident, that by the parable *He intends to unfold circumstances which actually transpire in connexion with that professedly Christian kingdom which God has established on earth.*

The kingdom of God then, is aptly illustrated by a marriage feast, which a certain King made for his Son. And in making this feast, be it observed, nothing which was necessary in order to render the banquet both substantial and to the party instituting it honourable, had been omitted. Sufficient provision had with all prudence been made; oxen and fatlings had been killed; and all things were declared to be ready. On the strength of this fact, the Lord of the banquet could worthily call whom he would to partake: could be justified in his dealings with every one to whom he should cause his invitation to be proclaimed. It is not true then, that He dealt treacherously; that his banquet was a thing of air; that with external frankness but internal fraud He sought to deceive.

Mark next. Because this King was true, because there was an honourable ground for his procedure, because for his subjects He

I provided a real banquet, therefore, *by the hand of his chosen, his faithful servants*. He sent forth to summon his unworthy lieges the marriage. Now in connexion with this call or summons, adds a truly interesting, a most remarkable fact—fact to which, the honour of divine truth, every regenerate and sanctified spirit would do well to take heed : more especially since the very same, with equal speciality and emphasis laid down in the text furnished by Luke. The fact to which I point is this, that quite distinct from that verbal call which under royal warrant was by servants delivered to the King's subjects, it is in a manner the most positive and emphatic asserted, that there did truly exist **PREVIOUS BIDDING** : as it is written,—“He sent forth his servants to call them (**THAT WERE BIDDEN**) to the wedding ; or in words employed by Luke, “sent his servant at supper-time to call them (**THAT WERE BIDDEN**), Come.” In both these accounts will be seen, that long before the time of supper, long before the sending forth through the King's servants of the verbal call, the parties to whom that verbal call was sent were parties *already virtually bidden*. In this statement, therefore, as by both evangelists expressly recorded, we have before us a truth of the very highest significance ; truth for which, in simple fealty to Christ, deference to the will and wisdom of the Eternal Father, we are absolutely bound to contend : nay ! truth, the integrity of which, the Lord's witnesses as the witnesses of His choice, are His debtors to the very death to defend. For had nothing striking, nothing significant been intended, then, the proper mode of stating the matter would have been this,—The supper being ready, the King sent forth his servants to call his lieges, subjects, citizens, to the marriage. Why then, I submit, this careful, this studious, nay ! this determined insisting on the fact, that *the parties as yet BY WORD UNBIDDEN, were parties actually and positively ALREADY BIDDEN* ? And that, mark, not once only, but on each separate occasion when the servants were re-dispatched upon their benevolent errand. For after the first message by royal mandate delivered had utterly failed, it is written,—“Again, he sent forth other servants, saying, Tell them (**WHICH ARE BIDDEN**), Behold, I have prepared my dinner : my oxen and my fatlings are killed, and all things are ready : come unto the marriage.” And even after the final rejection of the invitation by these parties, when sending forth His servants the poor, the maimed, the halt, and the blind, with gracious compulsion to constrain them to come in, the King is still found dignantly reiterating the very same words : “Then saith he to his servants, The wedding is ready, but they (**WHICH WERE BIDDEN**) were not worthy, &c., &c.” What then, be it enquired, the mind of the Holy Spirit in this clause ? The interpretation,

I affirm, is—can be but one: and is as follows: Through the Eternal Spirit, which without measure dwelt in the holy humanity of the Lord Jesus, that most august of beings was perfectly cognizant of all things, even to the secrets of hearts: as it is written, “He knew all men, and needed not that any should testify of man; for he knew what was in man.” (Jo. ii. 25.) Having therefore apprehended the yet future attempts of men to contravene the high purpose of God, that is, *deny Jehovah’s frank call of the non-elect to the marriage*,—and as a consequence, that **TO ME**, His faithful servant, there would in the course of time arise *necessity to contend against such denial of Jehovah’s wisdom, will, and purpose*,—He saw fit, by declaring a bidding distinct from, and altogether prior to the mere verbal call at the lips of His evangelical servants, to reveal that which from everlasting to everlasting was **ACTUAL**, or a **REALITY** in the Divine Mind. To wit, that in the counsels of old, of eternity, it had to Jehovah seemed good, hence for the glory of His great name He decreed, thus frankly to summon His enemies to the faith of Christ. By virtue of which decree, these parties albeit non-elect, have from the very beginning, even from everlasting, been held by the Lord God to be actually bidden—actually invited to the marriage. Thus it is, that throughout the several clauses of the parable that virtual bidding—in its reality, priority, and distinctiveness—is by use of language admirably adapted to the end, determinedly and perseveringly asserted. On no other supposition can that thrice repeated, that most emphatic clause to which I point, be fairly interpreted. I am therefore, I assume, in a sense the most absolute entitled to lay it down, that in this parable the purpose of Jehovah expressly is, **TO VINDICATE TO THE VERY UTTERMOST HIS ETERNAL PURPOSE IN THE NON-ELECT**. Hence it is all-important at this point to mark, that the sovereignly ordained act of submitting on the equitable conditions of repentance and faith a proffer of life to those parties, is but the execution or carrying out of that determination **TO INVITE OR BID**, which had from a past eternity dwelt in the Divine Mind. Is it therefore at all a just ground of astonishment, that God should see fit to regard the preaching of that free gift of life which is through repentance toward God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, as an actual, or bona-fidæ, **INVITATION TO THE MARRIAGE**.

The intervening portion of the parable is valuable as showing a deliberate, and in some instances malicious or persecuting rejection of the divine call: it is too plain, to need that I should dwell upon it. The concluding clause of Christ’s teaching however is such as to call for express notice. Because, therein for the *fourth time*, the Son of God emphatically asserts the fixed purpose

of the Divine Mind as having from a past eternity been, to call or bid to the marriage banquet souls, who though they do indeed in their way come to that feast, yet through contempt of the wedding-garment—in other words, neglect by repentance and faith to obtain the King's imputation of righteousness to their souls—are ultimately bound hand and foot and cast into outer darkness. In connexion with *such*, the Lord of glory Himself plainly avouches the existence both of an eternal and an actual bidding: saying,—“*For many ARE CALLED, but few ARE CHOSEN.*” Truth which effectually and for ever settles the fact, that the destination of the verbal call, invitation, or bidding of the gospel, is NOT to the elect alone, BUT TO AN INNUMERABLE MASS WHO ARE NOT CHOSEN—WHO MAKE END IN THE BLACKNESS OF DARKNESS FOR EVER.

This scripture stands so determinedly embattled against the error of those who deny the evangelical purpose of God in the non-elect, that the most strenuous attempts are made to evade it. This is done by the disingenuous, the short-sighted attempt, to ascribe the parable under this or that method of interpretation to the Mosaic economy alone. With all such unworthy resort to subterfuge I am enabled very effectually to deal, by pointing out to the conscientious enquirer the two following facts: first, that even granting the position contended for, that the parable refers exclusively (which it does not) to the Mosaic economy, the whole difficulty of which such interpreters would relieve themselves, *abides as entire upon the head of the Jew as upon that of the Gentile.* And secondly, that by the expression “kingdom of heaven,” which in the Scripture *has but one earthly reference*, viz., to that gospel kingdom which through the death of Christ has been set up on earth, the interpretation contended for by these persons is seen to be altogether inadmissible. While to the utter confusion of all such interpreters, the broad fact which from the infallible page of inspiration shines nobly out is, *that the banquet to which THE NON-ELECT WERE FRANKLY BIDDEN BUT REFUSED TO COME, was the very same, and no other, at which through the regenerating influence of the Holy Spirit THE ELECT, BOTH JEWS AND GENTILES, WERE CONSTRAINED TO SIT DOWN.* More damaging however to this wilful misinterpretation than all else, is the reflection with which the unerring Saviour winds up the parable, to wit, “*FOR MANY ARE CALLED (that is, by verbal message to the gospel banquet) BUT FEW ARE CHOSEN.*”

How admirably, be it in passing remarked, does this early antepentecostal and symbolical teaching of the Son of God, agree with the very latest and clearest revelations of the Holy Spirit, as found in the epistolary testimony of the apostle Paul: and how beyond the possibility of denial does this epistolary testimony

of the inspired Paul, fix the true interpretation of the parable to be that which I have laid down : thereby confounding for ever the misinterpretations of the gainsayers. Listen : for thus at the mouth of His matchless instrument Paul, is it by the Spirit of God signified to the Churches. "Let us therefore fear, lest, a promise being left us of entering into his rest, any of you should seem to come short of it. For unto us was the GOSPEL PREACHED, as well as UNTO THEM : but the WORD PREACHED did not profit THEM, not being mixed with FAITH IN THEM THAT HEARD IT. . . Seeing therefore it remaineth that some must enter in, AND THEY TO WHOM IT WAS FIRST PREACHED ENTERED NOT IN BECAUSE OF UNBELIEF. . . Let us labour therefore to enter into that rest, lest any man fall after the same example OF UNBELIEF." (Heb. iv. 1, 2, 6, 11.)

But before closing the metaphorical evidence of the Spirit to the actuality of the important position which I defend, I here in the presence of all who contend against the divine purpose in the non-elect, take leave most explicitly to affirm, that the parable of the sower does with force fully as effectual as that of the sister parable above cited, corroborate and confirm Jehovah's purpose. That is, in a manner the very plainest it sets forth four distinct classes OF SINNERS, in whose hearts, without distinction or difference, the seed of the gospel word was by the servant of God sown. Of these several classes, *three out of the four were non-elect*. The same grand truth is re-asserted in the parable of the gospel net. That net, without pretence at discrimination was cast into the great sea of intellectual and moral being, and ACTUALLY GATHERED OF EVERY KIND : *of which general take, THE BAD OR NON-ELECT were ultimately separated from the GOOD OR ELECT, and cast away.* (Matt. xiii. 47, 48.) The very same truth is maintained in the parable of the tares of the field. Satan made use of the general call of the gospel to corrupt the purity of the Church, by instigating many without the wedding robe of the divine righteousness to pretend to follow Christ. These were only a disgrace to their profession—mere tares—having none of the fruits of divine grace—no real resemblance to wheat. *They are ultimately gathered out of the gospel kingdom, separated, and burned.* (Matt. xiii. 37.) The same grand truth is again set forth in the parable of the barren fig tree. It was planted within the vineyard, or pale of the visible Church : and though it bore no fruit, yet year after year was it in an instrumental point of view *dealt with by all the appliances of the vineyard* : moreover, was, as plainly stated, destined to be *cut down* when to the uttermost these had failed. (Luke xiii. 6—9.) It cannot be that effectual grace was intended by the appliances of the husbandman, for such grace raises up a tree of righteous-

ness ; and to talk of cutting down in connexion with the glorious operation of the divine grace, would be to dishonour, as much the dignity and power of the Spirit, as the eternal purpose of Jehovah. Lastly, the very same truth is with unmistakable plainness set forth in the parable of Dives. That poor wretch, from the midst of the torment of hell, entreated the great Abraham that he would send Lazarus from the dead to testify to his five brethren, lest they also should fall alive into the same eternal damnation. The simple answer was, "*They HAVE THE WORD OF GOD : let them hear it.*" It is not by the great Abraham affirmed, that the word of life is not for them, but the reverse : *they HAVE IT, let them HEAR IT* : for if they contemptuously regard and reject that, *NEITHER WILL THEY BELIEVE* though one were actually sent from the dead." (Luke xvi. 27—31.)

So much for the symbolical teaching of Christ : of the very same character are all his direct and unfigurative discourses : those also of his Apostles. Out of the whole mass of these it would be simply impossible to show *a solitary one*, that was not by God addressed to men indiscriminately. That this fact may be made publicly manifest, I here in the presence of all the P. R. Baptist Churches, challenge the gainsayers TO ADDUCE ONE!!! That there are in these discourses occasional references to the elect in particular, no ingenuous mind would for a moment presume to deny. But that Christ neglected to preach the gospel home to the ears and consciences of the non-elect—failed to convict them of unbelief in Himself and charge with the guilt of it—a man must be hardened indeed, prejudice-warped to the very uttermost, to deny.

But, forasmuch as the evangelical responsibility of the non-elect is exactly that which has been shewn—the substance of the divine requirements on which it rests precisely that which has been represented—therefore, with a view to warn all who through a contrary teaching have been stretched at ease upon that deadliest of all couches, *the notion, that for A CHRIST DESPISED is no distinct, no eternal responsibility*, I feel bound, as a duty both momentous and imperative, to close this exposition of divine requirement and human responsibility with the following unutterably solemn testimony. It is written,—"*Because I HAVE CALLED, and ye refused ; I HAVE STRETCHED OUT MY HANDS and no man regarded ; but ye HAVE SET AT NAUGHT my counsel, and WOULD NONE of my reproof : I also will laugh at your calamity ; I will mock when your fear cometh ; when your fear cometh as desolation, and your destruction cometh as a whirlwind ; when distress and anguish cometh upon you. Then shall they call upon me, but I will not answer ; they shall seek me early, but they shall not find me : for THEY HATED know-*

ledge, and DID NOT CHOOSE the fear of the Lord : THEY WOULD NONE of my counsel : THEY DESPISED all my reproof. Therefore shall they eat the fruit of *their own way*, and be filled with *their own devices*. For the turning away of the simple shall slay them, and the prosperity of fools shall destroy them": (Prov. i. 24.) : yea! and by the gospel itself—that 'gospel which they have disregarded and rejected—shall there as certainly as God is truth, His soul equity, accrue to them a deeper damnation.

CHAPTER II.

THAT STRANGE THEOLOGICAL ERROR, ON THE STRENGTH OF WHICH THE DIVINE REQUIREMENTS SET FORTH IN THE PREVIOUS CHAPTER HAVE BEEN REPUDIATED, AND THE AUGMENTED OR EVANGELICAL RESPONSIBILITY OF THE NON-ELECT DENIED, EXAMINED AND EXPLODED.

IN establishing the case for Jehovah, the next thing incumbent on me is, to expose a gross theological blunder under cover of which, those who rely upon human reason attempt to justify their denial of the Lord's right to cause repentance and faith to be preached to the unregenerate.

The extraordinary misconception with which I am now about to deal, be it specially observed, has ever by the rationalistic party been esteemed THE VERY STRONGEST GROUND, on which to defend their false practice of not preaching the gospel as by God commanded. Having deemed the argument which on the strength of it they oppose to apostolic practice to be impregnable, they make of that argument a citadel: within the sheltering bulwark of which, not merely the unreflecting controversialists of the villages, but the most illustrious of the company of the preachers, do, when by the uncompromising truths of Scripture assailed, with all confidence take inglorious refuge. Let the reader therefore once more for a span grant me his attention, while in the name of the Lord I come against this high fortress of human reason. He shall, I promise him, see its foundation (for the theological blunder to which I have pointed is that foundation) absolutely, to use a Shaksperian expression, "blown at the moon."

The singularly absurd theological error now to be exposed, in the hallucination effluent from which those who in this dispute rely upon natural reason are found to walk, is set up upon that glorious work of grace which the Holy Spirit is pleased to accomplish in the elect, and is clearly represented as follows.

With the Covenant of Grace for a base, it is first of all scripturally and very correctly argued. "Forasmuch as with express

design to secure the salvation of the elect, a covenant of grace has from everlasting to everlasting been ratified between the Divine Persons of the Trinity, therefore, in due season the Holy Spirit sheds on the elect His quickening, His irresistible grace; thus first of all reducing to repentance, and secondly, through His own high gift of faith exalting to a condition of justification. This soul-quickening grace operates upon them most freely, most independently: hence their repentance and faith are by Scripture declared to be not of themselves, but the sovereign gift of God." Thus far, I bear my opponents witness, they speak well: up to this point we tread purely scriptural ground. But now, hard following comes that gross misconception, on the strength of which is set up their rationalistic decree against apostolic preaching. That misconception is as follows. Because repentance and faith in the elect are a result of the absolute power of the Holy Spirit, therefore it is grossly imagined that they are His acts: hence, forthwith for these Christian graces is fabricated a *patent name*; they are by those who deny the Lord's purpose in the non-elect, henceforth denominated—"SPIRITUAL ACTS." And now that this singularly inapplicable title has been conferred upon them, it is by those who rely upon the deductions of their own reason argued as follows. "The dispositions of repentance and faith in the elect exist through grace of the Holy Spirit: they are therefore, manifestly, *spiritual acts*. But the natural man has no power to perform spiritual acts, for he has not the gift of the Holy Spirit. Since then for the non-elect soul to perform spiritual acts is a downright impossibility, it cannot be right to require them at his hand. To do so, would not only be unreasonable and unjust, but would be altogether useless. Were God therefore by the gospel to call the non-elect to repentance and faith, it would be to mock them, to trifle with them, tauntingly, and with apparent sincerity tell them to do impossibilities. Therefore," (for thus runs the unjustifiable, the highly treasonable conclusion), "it is NOT lawful for Jehovah to require of the non-elect repentance and faith—is NOT lawful for a minister of the gospel to obey Jehovah by calling men to such acts—is NOT lawful for the evangelical labourer to tread in the footsteps of the Son of God and his Apostles—yea! is NOT lawful for any one to magnify the wisdom, will, and sovereign right of God, by preaching as in the Scriptures commanded."

Such the argument based upon the work of the Holy Spirit in the elect, by which the rationalizing opponents of apostolic preaching seek to make good their system. And while to an unreflecting, or an untrained mind, such specious reasoning will doubtless seem self-evident and conclusive, yet is it in reality altogether fallacious; deriving *plausibility*, exclusively, through that theological blunder

to which I have pointed, and with which in this chapter I shall deal. Let the ear of every Christian therefore attend, while in defence of the divine wisdom and prerogative, I make manifest the theological delinquency of all who abet this rash reasoning.

To their baseless argument then first of all I reply, that the *incompetency* of those who rely on natural reason to distinguish between things which radically differ, can never avail to render one and the same, those distinct and differing things which *they* thus blindly confound. Against the wisdom of all therefore who adopt the above fallacious reasoning, I most expressly record, that they *do* thus jumble or confound things which differ. Now this being the charge, it is next necessary to ask, What are those two things, by nature so dissimilar and distinct, which are through the theological incompetency of these erring controversialists, thus sadly, thus absurdly confounded? To this, I very plainly reply, REPENTANCE AND FAITH *on the one hand, and* THE REGENERATING ACTION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT *on the other*. The latter, the regenerating action of the Spirit, is a purely SPIRITUAL ACT, and the *only* spiritual act involved in the entire case. Its end, described in scriptural language is, to quicken or communicate divine life to the soul : in which quickening is comprehended, *enlightenment of the understanding, softening of the heart, and spiritual renewing of the affections*. Now *this*, is one thing, and will at a glance be seen to be purely divine ; an operation effected by immediate power from above,—the inbreathing of the Holy Ghost. This gracious forth-putting of the divine energy for regeneration, being absolute action on the part of the Holy Ghost, is very justly called *a spiritual act* : here the propriety of such language may not be disputed. Nevertheless that spiritual act on the part of the Holy Ghost, is certainly not repentance, nor yet faith ; unless indeed by some wildly erring advocate of anti-scriptural practice it should be proved, THAT GOD REPENTS FOR THE CREATURE—THAT HE LIKEWISE BELIEVES FOR THE SAME. This divine and spiritual act, I repeat, is in itself neither repentance nor faith : it is simply *quickenings by the breath of the Holy Spirit*, to the end that repentance and faith *may* ultimately ensue in the soul. But a work thus purely of God—(which if neither God repenting for the creature nor for that creature believing, is consequently not repentance nor faith but a means only by which these graces are secured)—a work I say thus purely of God, is, it must be admitted, something *distinct, unique, divine*. Hence is not, after the fashion of those who advocate antisciptural practice, to be confounded with that moral state which in the intellect, heart, and mind, is destined to result from it. But contrariwise : it is *at all times absolutely indispensable, that this purely divine ope-*

ration of the Spirit be in its integrity kept before the mind ; and that to itself, exclusively, the term spiritual act or action—if indeed that term must be employed—be applied.

But now, withdrawing for a moment the eye from God's divine and spiritual act, behold, first, the *immediate* effect of that act upon the creature, and secondly, its *ultimate* issues. Under this quickening action of the Holy Spirit, this forth-putting of His divine energy upon the soul, (*which remember is the only "spiritual act" in the whole case*), the immediate effect upon the understanding of the creature is, an enlightened state ; upon the heart, a softened state ; upon the affections, a spiritually renewed state. Here then we have before us a divine cause, *which is one thing*, and an immediate or proximate effect upon the creature, *which is quite another*. That quickening energy which by a spiritual act on the part of the Holy Ghost is brought to bear upon the soul, comes to redress the sin-injured faculties of the creature ; and thus by the spiritual act of God, *which is one thing*, we have the renewed state of the creature intellect and heart, *which is quite another*. But while upon the creature the immediate result of this divine operation is, as has been said, the enlightenment of the understanding, softening of the heart, and renewing of the affections, yet even this is not repentance, nor yet faith : it is only the first or proximate effect of that *spiritual act*, which has by God in free mercy been vouchsafed. Repentance and faith are a secondary effect, a subsequent issue, of that first or proximate effect which results from the action of the Spirit. By which is meant, that under that enlightened state of the creature understanding, that softened or feeling state of the creature heart, that spiritually inclined state of the creature affection, which has by the Spirit of God been begotten, the truth of the inspired Word begins vividly, or as an august and solemn reality, to appeal to the understanding, to penetrate the heart, and to draw the affection ; of which, one ultimate issue is a supernatural *creature repentance*, and another a supernatural *creature faith*. So then the creature dispositions of repentance and faith, are but *ultimate issues* of a proximate or immediate effect of the divine power : which proximate or immediate effect of the divine power was, *enlightenment of the understanding, softening of the heart, and spiritualizing of the affections*. While the agent through whose divine action—sole spiritual act—the above effects both immediate and ultimate ensue, IS THE HOLY GHOST.

But whereas by virtue of a direct spiritual act on the part of God that first or immediate effect of enlightening, softening, and renewing, is to the creature infallibly secured ; and whereas from this first or immediate effect—this enlightening, softening, and renewing—that second blessed effect of supernatural repentance

and faith does inevitably succeed ; will any advocate of antiscip-
tural practice presume to assert, that the grand spiritual act of the
Holy Ghost by which the said primary effect of enlightening, soft-
ening, and renewing, is in the creature infallibly secured, and that
merely secondary result, or result which flows from such enlight-
ened, softened, and renewed state, to wit, the moral dispositions
or graces of repentance and faith, are one and the same thing ?
To assert it, would infallibly involve the false, the utterly mon-
strous conclusion, THAT JEHOVAH REPENTS AND BELIEVES FOR
HIS CREATURES. Here then have we before us three distinct
things : the first, a spiritual act on the part of God unto regenera-
tion : the second, a regenerate moral state of the creature as the
immediate or proximate effect of the divine power : the third, that
Christian disposition called repentance, and that other Christian
disposition called faith, as a secondary result, or result flowing
from that new or regenerate moral condition which had preceded
it. It is then certain, yea ! evident, that the first and third of
these things though connected, are not one and the same. They
are therefore, (each in its integrity), to be preserved separate :
are by a righteous distinction between cause and effect—between
the divine and spiritual act for renewing, and the creature acts
effluent from it—to be held apart, not blindly and foolishly con-
founded. The absurd jumbling together, and under the term
“ spiritual acts ” confounding of these distinct and differing things,
is the rock upon which those who deny the evangelical purpose of
Jehovah in the non-elect have split. By which, I expressly mean,
that on the strength of that extremely ill-chosen term, “ *spiritual
acts*,” the creature dispositions of repentance and faith in the elect
have been obstinately identified with their producing cause. And
having through this sad theological blundering been represented
as divine acts, (substantially as Jehovah repenting and believing
for His children), it has by the parties thus blundering with all bold-
ness, all dogmatism been affirmed, *that God has no right to require at
the hand of natural men* “ SPIRITUAL ACTIONS,” *which the natural and
non-elect man, as is evident, has no power whatever to perform.*

By the above lucid exposition of the mystic graces of repentance
and faith in the elect, I have taken upon me to correct the error
and dissipate the mental confusion of those, who assume right to ma-
lign the evangelical purpose of God in the non-elect. That patent
name, by which in their ignorance it has seemed good to them to
designate the graces of the elect, I have demonstrated to be alto-
gether fallacious, yea ! utterly absurd : fallacious, because con-
founding as though they were one, things which radically differ ;
absurd, because imputing the act of God which is the only *spiritual
act* in the entire case, to the carnal, material creature. Hear

it, O reader, for thus by the advocates of antisciptural practice is it pertinaciously and dogmatically affirmed,—“*Repentance and faith in the elect of God are spiritual acts.*” But the elect, I maintain, are mere creatures—earthly, carnal, material; consequently are incapable of spiritual action: as it is written, “That which is born of the flesh is flesh.” Then according to the proposition of these theologians, the case reduced to plain language stands thus, viz., “Repentance and faith in the carnal, material, earthly, corrupt but elect creature, being spiritual acts, are the actions of God in that elect creature. Which proposition, if correctly apprehended, is in substance neither more nor less than this, *that Jehovah, the high and lofty One inhabiting eternity and all its praises, DOES HIMSELF REPENT OF THE SIN OF HIS CREATURES; DOES HIMSELF BELIEVE ON HIS SON FOR THE REMISSION OF THEIR SINS.* But if proposition outrageous as this, may not in support of the wretched dogma of any body of professing Christians be suffered to stand, then, in defiance of prejudice itself I assume right once and for ever to lay it down, that repentance and faith in the elect are NOT as by the advocates of antisciptural practice asserted, “SPIRITUAL ACTIONS;” but only A RESULT OR CONSEQUENCE OF SPIRITUAL ACTION BY THE HOLY GHOST. And I here crave leave of these parties to repeat the truth, that a blind confounding together by them of such things as are by nature distinct and different, CANNOT, *however much for the sake of THEIR ERROR they may desire it, MAKE TWO TO BECOME ONE.*

Having exposed the deceptive character of that patent term, application of which to the graces of repentance and faith in the elect, has in the minds of both teachers and taught of the P. R. Baptist Churches been the cause of so much mental confusion, it is next in order to the full elucidation of Jehovah’s counsel absolutely necessary, to exhibit a still further distinction which those who deny the purpose of God in the non-elect seem altogether inadequate to understand; viz., the broad difference which exists between *that* repentance and faith which at the hand of elect and non-elect are in equity by Jehovah demanded, and *such* repentance and faith as for Christ’s sake He through the Holy Spirit is on the former pleased to bestow. It might possibly happen, now that the fallacious argument of the advocates of antisciptural practice has been clean swept away, that even among these a few may be found who shall be disposed to listen. The Lord, that they *may* learn, grant them ears to hear, what He through the Spirit has in his Word delivered to the Churches.

It is written, “I will publish the name of the Lord: ascribe ye greatness unto our God. He is the Rock, his work is PERFECT: for all his ways ARE JUDGMENT: a God of truth and

without iniquity, JUST AND RIGHT IS HE." (Deut. xxxii. 3, 4.) Now granting this record with regard to Jehovah and His dealings to be true, then, to the least intelligent it must be evident, that He *cannot* because He *will* not do wrong. But if that be conceded, it follows, that it is the purest of all pure impossibilities, that by little or by much, the Lord should oppress the weak creatures of His hand : for to oppress and tyrannize has by His own mouth been pronounced wicked, and wickedness by virtue of His essential holiness the Lord Jehovah will not do. If this fact, for which in justice to the Eternal God I contend, be indisputable and must stand, then, when this Most Holy of beings by the mouth of His incarnate Son, the mouths also of all the inspired Apostles sees fit publicly to summon elect and non-elect sinners to repentance, it is clear, that He is not for such act justly chargeable with oppression. But (alas for the rationalizing teachers !) by that argument which on the strength of the absurd term "*spiritual acts*" has been set up, oppression is determinedly imputed to Him. For does not the false logic of these parties run exactly thus, "Repentance and faith being wrought by the Holy Ghost are spiritual acts ; and spiritual acts cannot possibly be performed by natural men ; but the non-elect live and die natural men, hence to them these spiritual acts are impossible : were God therefore to require such spiritual acts at their hand, He would be requiring of them impossibilities, consequently would be a deliberate oppressor." Such the baseless argument by which (possibly in some instances at unawares) those who rely on natural reason convert the Lord's dealings with the non-elect into wickedness ; for I have already shewn, and the illustrious Mr. Philpot himself admits it, that Jehovah *has* by the mouths of his Apostles and Son called both the elect and non-elect to repentance. By that false argument therefore which in these pages I unmask, those who trust in the deductions of their own reason do manifestly incur the guilt of exhibiting the Eternal God in the character of an oppressor. Moreover, it is a fact, that in thus absurdly dogmatizing, they actually glory in their shame ; exalting this argument as the very bulwark of their system ; making it the impregnable (as they deem) citadel within the sheltering pale of which to defend a notoriously antisciptural practice. As a spearman in Israel, however, I come on behalf of God against their high towers. With the weapons of the sanctuary, truth on the one hand, and equity on the other, I withstand the argumentation of these confused reasoners. Let the reader stand by and mark the fate of their logic, while beneath the heel of a too merited reprobation, I grind its pretension absolutely to powder.

I have said then, nor said only, but by a mighty mass of inspired evidence proved, that through His Son and the inspired Apostles Jehovah *has* summoned the non-elect—moreover, that by His Word and faithful ministers Jehovah *does still* summon the non-elect to repentance and to faith. But now, in full view of that fact let the reader be pleased to note, that I have never yet said, nor has that mighty mass of inspired evidence which I have adduced ever shewn, that by His Son and the inspired Apostles Jehovah has commanded, or that by His Word and faithful ministers Jehovah does still command, the non-elect **BY THE RENEWING OF THE HOLY GHOST TO REPENT**. If I have at any time affirmed this, let the advocates of antisciptural practice bear witness. Or if the mighty mass of inspired evidence which I have adduced has ever shewn it, let the same parties lay finger upon the line and passage. Or if the glorious Bible in any particular part, chapter, or verse, has set it forth, let those who deny Jehovah's evangelical purpose in the non-elect produce the record. Can they do this? They certainly can *not*. Were they to try, they must inevitably fail. Then the Lord, whose I am, and the evangelical glory of whom also I defend, *has NOT I maintain required the non-elect to perform "SPIRITUAL ACTS."* And if, as now shown, the Holy One of Israel has *not* required the non-elect to perform "spiritual acts," then, how is it that presumptuous men obstinately insist on laying *this wickedness* to His charge? Why, I demand, under such circumstances do they persist in *inventing their FALSE DEFINITIONS, that by force of these, as their instrument, THEY MAY ARRAIGN DEITY ITSELF AS A TRANSGRESSOR?*

But turning now from the sickening presumption of these self-complaisant judges, let the reader next be pleased to observe, that that repentance which at the hand of the non-elect the Lord in pure equity has seen fit to require, **NOT BEING SUPERNATURAL REPENTANCE BY THE SPIRITUAL ACT OF THE HOLY GHOST**, is nothing more, nothing less, than a befitting repentance for sin at the hand of the wrong doer himself. But *that* befitting repentance for wrong done, which in setting a free proffer of life before the creature that has sinned Jehovah sees fit to require, *is one thing*; and that greatly more glorious repentance through the Spirit, which by virtue of His covenant with Christ He is pleased on the elect to bestow, *is quite another*. The former is a just and equitable requirement, because of sin; the latter, is a gracious unmerited gift, in sin's despite. The former, that is, the equitable requirement at the hand of the non-elect for sin, belongs (as in a subsequent chapter I shall clearly shew) to One Covenant; the latter, that is, the gracious and most unmerited gift of God to the *elect*, pertains to a Covenant altogether distinct. The

former, can by no abuse of language be called a spiritual act; the latter, through that misapplication of terms and confusion of thought to which in the foregoing pages I have pointed, by not very clearly minded theologians, may. The former, is that, which according to the strictest rule of equity (as Jehovah counts equity) ought by every creature that has done wrong to be rendered; the latter, is that, which when what in strict equity ought to be rendered is by the wrong doer *not* rendered, the Lord for the sake of His Son vouchsafes through the Spirit to excite in the souls of the elect. The former, is that, which as necessary but not yielded, does, under its own peculiar Covenant, lead to augmented or gospel condemnation; the latter, is that, which though not by the creature voluntarily yielded yet as brought to pass by the immediate finger of God, does, according to its greater, its more glorious Covenant, issue in unmerited or free grace salvation. The former, by openly illustrating the malignity of sin, its determined opposition to the noblest ways of God, is, in the presence of the powers, principalities, and dominions above, eternally to mark the hideous nature of that corrupt principle; the latter, by unmistakably manifesting the transcendent character of the divine benevolence, is, in the hearts of the same angelic and arch-angelic hosts, everlastingly to exalt the goodness, the moral excellency of Jehovah. The former, as an instrument by which to display the dispositional antagonism of the non-elect—their implacable enmity to the blessed God so made manifest in the Humanity of Christ—is to vindicate the final, the irrevocable judgment of Jehovah in their damnation; the latter, as a means by which practically to demonstrate the otherwise inconceivable, altogether incredible invincibility of the divine love, its triumph through agony and death over the hate and malice of the elect, is to magnify, or to the uttermost exalt, that august principle of the divine bosom in their salvation.

With the eye full upon these facts, I now of every dispassionate thinker, every upright and ingenuous Christian spirit see fit to demand, Is it proved, or is it not, that that repentance and faith which at the hand of the wrong-doing creature Jehovah is in equity pleased to demand, is altogether separate and distinct from that other and higher repentance and faith, which for His Son's sake, He through the Eternal Spirit is pleased to bestow? I assume it to be granted: hence again put the question. Since the case is so, then, are these separate and distinct things (after the fashion of those who rely upon the deductions of reason) to be treated as one and the same? or, are they, as here insisted on, *to be considered apart, and distinguished and dealt with as different?* If by my candidly minded readers it be conceded that

they are to be held distinct, and as differing, nay ! very widely differing, are not to be absurdly confounded, then, why I ask has this not been done ? why to the prejudice of the divine glory, has the just distinction between things thus dissimilar been so causelessly ignored—so most unrighteously disregarded ? And again, why on the strength of this most reprehensible dealing has the divine decree to call sinners to repentance—decree by act of the Incarnate Son and his inspired Apostles so publicly, so perseveringly exalted—been as a thing unjust, and by consequence altogether unworthy, by our rationalizers ignominiously branded ?

But I pass on. Since for the manifestation of falsehood the most effectual of all means is the clear exhibition of the truth, let the reader yet further be pleased to observe, that if that repentance and faith which in setting a proffer of life before the non-elect Jehovah deems it right to require, be altogether different and distinct from that other faith and repentance which through the Spirit He vouchsafes to bestow—if the former be a mere moral requirement quite apart from the Holy Ghost, consequently involving what by no abuse of language can be called divine or spiritual acts—then in the case of every true Christian it is for the glory of God absolutely necessary, that he should be clear in mind with respect to the differing natures of these two things : that being thus clear, he may henceforth be in a position to vindicate against all misrepresentation, the act of God in calling non-elect wrong doers to repentance. What then, I ask, is the nature of that repentance which in setting a free proffer of life before the masses, the Lord God as a necessity in equity assumes right to demand ? I have already laid down as fact, that it is not such repentance as through the spiritual action or renewing of the Holy Ghost, transpires in every soul of Christ's redeemed : for that, as a pure gratuity from above, abides only in God's own power ; hence to the creature is a manifest impossibility. It cannot therefore be that. But the repentance which at the hand of the non-elect wrong doer Jehovah *does* see fit to require, is, a befitting recognition of the evil, the hell-worthiness of sin—personal humiliation before God because of it—an absolute forsaking of its paths—and a turning to God with full purpose of heart. This, in the case of every one that has transgressed the law and departed from God, Jehovah has a right to demand. Who shall dare to dispute it ? And it is worse than vain at this point to object, that the creature is not in a position to render it : for that, provided always it be held according to the representation of Scripture, *may*, nay ! *must* be freely conceded. But that, as I trust in the following chapter I shall be enabled most decisively to shew, is of no virtue whatever to alter the equity of the case.

which equity is, *that in freely placing a proffer of life before the guilty creature that has sinned, Jehovah should call that erring creature to repentance.*

But if leaving now the case of the non-elect we for a moment turn to that of the elect, What I ask is the nature of that special, that particular repentance, which when such repentance as according to the strictest principle of equity Jehovah has a right to demand is not yielded, He by a *still greater stretch of sovereign prerogative* sees fit for Christ's sake to bestow? I answer, not the same as that, which of the non-elect He has a right to demand; but something far higher—something altogether supernatural—a repentance which is in absolute defiance of nature's hardness and impenitency—a repentance, in short, resulting from power omnipotent, invincible, and divine. Such repentance, evidences the high, the holy vitality at its root, to the confusion (if I may so speak) of the party in whom it is generated. And how? By supernatural discovery of personal vileness; supernatural loathing of self for sin; supernatural reverence for the glory of the Divine Majesty; supernatural realization of the beauty of holiness; supernatural yearning for reconciliation, union, communion, with God; and supernatural attachment to the Deity, as in the brightness of His moral splendour made manifest in the face of Christ Jesus. Repentance of which the root is thus deep, the effect thus unearthly and glorious, is through the quickening breath of the Eternal Spirit, and to the praise of the sovereign love of Jehovah alone.

The great difference, both essential and practical, between that repentance which in strict righteousness Jehovah sees fit to demand, and that far nobler repentance which as a purely sovereign gift He is pleased to bestow, having now been made fully manifest, it is in concluding this chapter absolutely imperative, that I unveil and set forth in the light that singularly intense confusion of thought, which in connexion with this subject is peculiar to the minds of the enemies of Jehovah's right.

I have already more than once had occasion to shew, that the great champion of this rationalistic, this most fallacious view, the learned Mr. Philpot, through inventing and applying to the repentance and faith of the elect the highly inapposite term "*spiritual acts*," has full in the path of his followers laid down the stone of stumbling. The stone therefore being by the hand of the master thus laid, his unreflecting disciples have to this day continued to fall and be broken upon it. Thus it is, that in the very latest public decree which has issued from the council of these men, the following absolutely treasonable nonsense has been inflicted upon the P. R. Baptist Churches.

THE TREASONABLE AND ABSURD DECREE.

"We deny duty-faith and duty-repentance; these terms signifying that it is every man's duty to spiritually and savingly repent and believe. We deny also that there is any capability in man by nature, to any spiritual good whatever. *So that we reject the doctrine THAT MEN IN A STATE OF NATURE SHOULD BE EXHORTED TO TURN TO GOD.*" (See Extra Rule, specially added to those adopted by the Council intimidating through means of the ministerial Relief Fund : G. Standard, August, 1872.)

Such the singular monument, which by a self-constituted council of P. R. Baptist divines, has been erected to mark the extraordinary perfection of their own mental confusion. However much it is to be lamented that men *should* thus publicly proclaim their theological incompetency, yet this having been done, since their rationalistic fiat embodies absolute treason toward the wisdom and right of God, there is no choice left me but on God's behalf to deal with it.

This P. R. Baptist canon, then, it will be seen is divided into three distinct clauses; on each of which, with a view to the enlightenment of individual members of this denomination, I shall submit a few strictures; I shall make them as short as possible. Considered then in its first clause, we have in the canon in question a most extraordinary confounding of things which are essentially different, to wit, creature duty on the one hand, and divine gift on the other. The writers, be it observed, speak first of duty-faith and repentance: well, what be it asked do they mean? **This.** Such repentance and faith as it is the mere duty of the creature to render. The terms duty-faith and duty-repentance can mean neither more nor less than that. In opposition to this creature duty of repentance and faith, the said writers speak in the next place of spiritually and savingly repenting and believing: well, again be it asked, what do they mean? Unquestionably, to repent and believe under regeneration of soul by the Holy Ghost. Such spiritual and saving belief can be neither more nor less than that. With this light, let the reader now carefully examine the first clause of the canon under consideration, and he will see that it speaks on this wise. "We deny such repentance and faith as is the *pure duty* of the creature, that term *signifying* that it is every man's duty to repent and believe under *regeneration of the Holy Ghost*. In plain words, "We deny *creature duty* to repent and believe, that term signifying duty to repent and believe *by the Holy Ghost*." In plainer words still, "We deny the CREATURE DUTY of repentance and faith, that term, CREATURE DUTY, signifying, duty to repent and believe by su-

PERNATURAL POWER—the regenerating POWER OF THE LIVING GOD.” Now is it possible, I ask, for confusion of thought—mental incompetency—to transcend this? Let the reader for one moment consider, that the creature-duty of repentance is one thing, but that the grace of repentance under regeneration of the Holy Ghost is quite another. The former, viz., the creature-duty of repentance, though spoken of for ever, can by no possibility signify the latter, or the grace of repentance through the Holy Ghost: and vice versâ, the latter can by no possibility signify the former. In defiance of which fact, thus fiat forth the theologians framing the treasonable canon in question, “We deny *duty-faith and duty-repentance*, taking these terms as signifying *faith and repentance through the Holy Ghost*.” Here then is open confounding both of terms and things: for the term *creature-duty*, can by no possibility signify *divine gift*. If then the repentance and faith spoken of be merely of *creature-duty*, how in that case can this term signify, *such spiritual or saving faith and repentance as are by the Holy Ghost*? From the foundation of the world, did ever incompetent schoolboy, I submit, blunder his matter thus egregiously? Will these super-eminently wise theologians be pleased to point out, the possibility of duty-faith signifying spiritual or saving faith by the Holy Ghost? will they unveil the mysterious, the all-prevailing principle by which, the latter may possibly be represented or signified by the former. But if they cannot, (and I here publicly challenge them to the experiment), then, is not the conclusion inevitable, that in the first clause of this strange canon, its writers have talked absolute nonsense? But why be it asked have they thus talked nonsense? Is not the soul-humbling conclusion but too apparent, to wit, out of the abundance of the prejudice in their own heart? Behold then, O reader, the blinding influence of this prejudice: the confusion of thought—intense darkness—which it has power to generate in the human brain.

But now, passing on to the second clause of the canon in question, I ask every competent thinker to say, whether its wisdom is not precisely in the similitude of the wisdom of the former. It runs thus, “We deny also that there is any capability in man by nature to any spiritual good whatever.” In this second highly gratuitous exhibition of theological incompetency, let the inquirer again mark the confusion of thought peculiar to these writers—their gross confounding in the mind of things which differ. But what things? The things already spoken of, to wit, that repentance, faith, and goodness to which, though fallen, the creature is nevertheless by God called, and such repentance, faith and goodness, as are of sovereign gift, through regeneration of the Holy

Ghost. The assertion of these parties in full is this : " We deny that man in a state of *nature* is capable of any *spiritual* good,—spiritual good of course being *repentance, faith, and sanctification by the Holy Ghost.*" Now would it not be just as sensible, just as philosophical to say,—“We deny the sun to be capable of being the moon, and the moon to be capable of being the evening star?” But while it is freely admitted that the sun is not capable of becoming the moon, nor the moon the evening star, yet might I not without in aught derogating from the dignity of my order as a creature endowed with intelligence, or at least common sense, ask these theologians,—Has the sun not a divinely ordained natural orbit in which he is debtor to move? so likewise the moon? and so the planet Hesperus? If they have, then, should not each revolve in that particular orbit which according to the law of the material universe is right? If it be granted, then, I submit, Were they not thus to act, would it not be deviation from the original constitution of things—departure from the right law of that material universe? It is answered, Yea. In the light of these facts then I ask, Though man in a state of nature be incapable, both of commanding the Holy Spirit and of assuming those supernatural graces which He alone has power to bestow, yet is there not in the case of every intelligent creature that has done evil a right or becoming moral orbit, in which body and soul he ought to revolve? If it be granted that there is, then, be it asked, Is not that right or befitting moral orbit true or genuine repentance? Who shall dare to deny it? Now, for this very thing Jehovah sees fit to call : Who shall disprove His right? And if that for which Jehovah calls, be on all sides admitted to be the proper moral orbit of the creature that has done wrong, and if this divine call for it be too comely, too needful, ay! in the nature of things moral too befitting to be demonstrated unjust, is not the disregard of it by that creature a further deviation from the way of rectitude—that way in which he ought to be found? I think those acute divines, who in the just dealings of God with the non-elect have taken upon themselves to condemn their Creator, will yet at the bar of the Lord Jesus Christ, find this case in a pre-eminent degree too hard for their rationalistically devised judgment. Be it therefore granted, that when a creature endowed with intellect and understanding has done wrong, the moral orbit in which that creature ought to be found is genuine repentance; be it also granted, that because this walk in repentance is altogether comely, therefore, in setting a proffer of life before the guilty Jehovah is to the uttermost justified in calling for it; be it moreover granted, that when through personal pride, love of sin, and causeless hatred of God, the creature

who according to the intrinsic comeliness of things ought to repent of his wrong does not thus repent, that contempt of his heart which disregards repentance is a much wider deviation from the way of rectitude ; and be it still further granted, that for such greatly wider deviation from the right way, it seems to the just Judge fit, under an augmented or evangelical sentence to condemn ; I say, be the whole position throughout, or in each particular head granted ; and in full view of it, let the writers of the absurd canon under consideration plainly say, *what connexion all this has with the Spirit of God, or work of grace which that glorious Being alone has the prerogative to set up in the heart ?* The obligation to repentance in which the creature stands bound, is through sin : and the reason why in His evangelical dealing with the non-elect Jehovah sees fit to call for repentance, is because it is equitable : and the ground on which ultimately He will condemn for disregard of that call, is because it is just. *What then has all this to do with the Holy Spirit, with a work which is exclusively His own, which is free, which He is debtor to no creature to bestow ?* Let those utterly incomprehensible theologians who, out of that intense confusion of thought which is peculiar to them, have penned the absurd canon to which I so righteously object, vouchsafe, if not for the honour of God yet at least for their own justification, to shew.

In the above specimens of highly antisciptural wisdom—wisdom brought forth and in full council ratified with express design to contravene the just dealings of God with the non-elect—let the reader satisfy himself as to the state of pitiable mental confusion into which, through reliance upon the deductions of natural reason, these professed opponents of the glory of their Maker have been betrayed.

But since in gospel charity I am debtor to extricate, or at least endeavour to extricate these theological guides of the Churches from the ditch which they have both digged and occupied—into which also they have plunged the thousands and tens of thousands of their too credulous disciples—I here take upon me to do for them that which they seem altogether incapable of doing for themselves, viz., place the real, the only subject-matter of enquiry in the case of the non-elect, before them in a clear light ; that beholding it in its extraordinary simplicity, they may henceforth escape that theological blundering, that singularly thick mist of rationalistic and fleshly confusion, in the dense darkness of which, they have now for a period far too extended most lamentably triumphed. The questions then, and the only questions which in connexion with the case of the non-elect can possibly arise, are *simplicity itself*, and are these. The first, Is it right that the intelligent creature that has done wrong should repent of his

wrong? The second, Is it a dealing in strict accordance with the principle of equity that Jehovah should require such repentance at his hand? The third, Is the judgment of that Holy One which condemns for contempt of His requirement altogether and absolutely just? Now these being the questions—and no other—it may at a glance be seen, that they have nothing whatever to do with the Holy Spirit; I mean with that work by which He vanquishes the contempt of the elect. Henceforth, therefore, that the purpose of God may be revered, I charge it upon the consciences of all true Christians in the P. R. Baptist Churches, that to the above simple questions, *and these alone*, they hold the confused minds of such of their teachers, as shall, out of their own prejudice and dense darkness, determine to trample on the will and sceptre of Jehovah.

It remains but to touch the concluding clause of the rationalistic canon in question: clause, I deeply regret to be obliged to state, embodying sentiment toward the Almighty in the highest degree contumacious and treasonable. That remarkably unfilial and arrogant passage runs thus: "*So that we reject the doctrine that men in a state of nature SHOULD BE EXHORTED TO TURN TO GOD.*" This antiscryptural enunciation, completes the iniquitous canon which with abundant reason I here designate a perpetual monument of mental confusion. The words, "*So that,*" with which this last clause commences, refer to the reasoning of the two which have gone immediately before, and in substance amount to this; viz., "Because of the rationalizing logic, intense mental confusion, and too palpable theological incompetency set forth or exhibited in the two leading clauses of the canon, *therefore, we reject the doctrine that men should be EXHORTED TO TURN TO GOD.*"

In face of this (probably in the whole protestant world matchless) emanation of pride and presumption, let the reader first of all be pleased to note, that its writers are men belonging to the nations of the Gentile world; that they are men claiming to possession of grace and obedience to Christ; that they are men in the character and position of teachers of the Church of Christ; and that they are men, who advocating protestant principle profess that the Word of God, unsupplemented, or to the exclusion of Papal dogma, is, and can only be, a reliable guide in salvation. With these facts in view, let it next be remembered, that for the express purpose of converting from heathenism the Gentiles, or nations to which these men belong, God elected, called, and thoroughly enriched with divine wisdom the great Apostle of the Gentiles—Paul. But not for the conversion of these nations only, but that in the hand of the Holy Ghost he should be an

infallible guide to the Church thus taken out from their midst: its guide, I say, through personal example, preaching, and the composition of his divinely elaborate Epistles. This man then, this Paul, is not in the wisdom of God set for a snare and trap to the Gentile Church, but a light from the throne of Deity; a light in the divine beam of which, if she will but consent steadfastly to walk, she may to the end of time escape the delusion, the rationalistic darkness, and the antisciptural practices, incidental to the unregenerate masses. Side by side therefore with the above infamous denial that sinful men should be exhorted to turn to God—denial in which the rationalizing parties exhibiting this false canon seem absolutely to triumph and glory—I proceed to place, as a swift witness against both their canon and themselves, the testimony and the practice of Paul: mark it. “Whereupon, O king Agrippa, I WAS NOT DISOBEDIENT UNTO THE HEAVENLY VISION: *but shewed first unto them of Damascus, and at Jerusalem, and throughout all the coasts of Judæa, and then to the Gentiles, THAT THEY SHOULD REPENT AND TURN TO GOD, AND DO WORKS MEET FOR REPENTANCE.*” (Acts xxvi. 19, 20.) Such the witness of Paul to his own inspired mission, personal example, and testimony. How admirably does it agree to the same word of inspiration, as exhibited by the prophets of the ancient Jewish Church. Listen: “Seek ye the Lord while he may be found, call ye upon him while he is near: let the *wicked* forsake his way, and the *unrighteous man* his thoughts: and LET HIM RETURN UNTO THE LORD, and he will have mercy upon him; AND TO OUR GOD, for he will abundantly pardon.” (Is. lv. 6, 7.) But hear once more the Spirit of God, as to the same effect, but more immediately in the august person of the Eternal Father, he bears witness, if I may so speak, from the very throne. “Say unto them, *As I live saith the Lord God*, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live: TURN YE, TURN YE from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel? (Ezek. xxxiii. 11.) And yet again,—“Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die? saith the Lord God: and not that he should RETURN FROM HIS WAYS and live? . . . Cast away from you all your transgressions, whereby ye have transgressed; and make you a new heart and a new spirit: for why will ye die, O house of Israel? For I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God: WHEREFORE TURN YOURSELVES, and live ye.” (Ezek. xviii. 23, 31, 32.) From the Old and the New Testament, each in this matter of exhorting the wicked to turn to God agreeing to the minutest particular, I have now before the Christian mind set forth the true counsel of Jehovah. The above truths are ab-

solutely insuperable—the very unveiling as it were of the bosom of God—the actual sealing of its innermost secret upon divine oath. On the strength of them, and with express design that the glory of the Great Being therein testifying may be magnified, I have not hesitated to stigmatize, as a thing in God's sight truly *infamous*, the concluding clause of the absolutely treasonable canon here scrutinized. That evil canon, together with the above highly merited animadversions, I now make over to those Churches for the intimidation of whom it was expressly designed : that it may stand forth in their presence, as a perpetual witness to the ignorance, pride, presumption, which a reliance on blind, carnal reason, never fails to beget in the heart.

Having now, not merely demonstrated the inapplicability of that definition, viz., “spiritual acts,” which in connexion with the supernatural graces of the Lord's elect has by the opponents of apostolic practice been adopted, but set forth, on one hand the character of that repentance which according to the strictest principle of equity Jehovah has a right of the non-elect to demand, on the other the nature of that greatly nobler repentance which according to covenant engagements with the Son He through the cross has just right to bestow, I need pursue this truly humbling theme no further. That delusive argument which upon the sole ground of their own theological blundering has by the antagonists of Jehovah's right been set up, and which, through a universally prevailing confusion of thought has in the P. R. Baptist denomination too long and too fondly been deemed impregnable, to wit, “*that repentance and faith being ‘SPIRITUAL ACTS’ God has no just right to require them of the non-elect;*” argument which, as a tower of strength for the defence of an unrighteous practice, has to the deluding of thousands and tens of thousands of the unreflecting, been by the dogmatism of their teachers exalted ; I (to use the language of Scripture) have in this chapter—“brought down—laid low—even to the ground—the very dust—given to the foot to tread it down—even the feet of the poor and the steps of the needy ;” yea ! the feet of every one who through its base sophistry, rank rationalism, and egregious falsehood—has been deceived—led astray—and in senseless antagonism to the right ways of God, ever-increasingly hardened.

In full view therefore of these faithful demonstrations—the solemnity of a rapidly approaching judgment—and the uncompromising rectitude of Him who shall be met upon the throne—once more approaching the consciences of all those who within the pale of the P. R. Baptist Churches make profession of faith, love, and obedience, I press home as in the presence of God the

enquiry. Is it for *you* (granting your claim to the divine adoption to be indeed well founded), *you* by regenerating grace so highly above the million exalted, through lending ear to the blundering deductions of those who rely upon carnal reason—in plain words, through homologating that very rationalism which is the glory and boast of infidelity—to suffer yourselves to be betrayed into a loathsome antagonism to the wisdom, will, and sovereign right of your Redeemer; that with flesh, spirit, and influence, (so much as by mere mortals it may be done), you should be found contravening—yea! in the unspeakably disgraceful act of resisting and sheltering the resisting—of the exalted purpose of Jehovah; that purpose, the deep intelligence at the root of which has set forth as its mark, its all-glorious aim, through manifestation of the ineffably excellent nature of Him who is life unto Israel, to add in the very highest to the welfare, swell out in the sublimest the interests, intensify in a way the most touching the happiness, of His whole pure moral and intellectual creation?

But enough! Denuded of cloak or covering, I leave this rationalistic judgment of the judges to the wisdom of Him, who in its season shall thoroughly deal with it. I have done the work of its demolition on earth: my commission extends no further. The piercing scrutiny of Jehovah, whose I am and whom I serve, shall thoroughly search out and finally make manifest the enormous measure of pride, vaingloriousness, prejudice, lying latent and unsuspected at the root. To *His* justice I commend all self-complaisant antagonists of the divine right, together with this manifestation (in opposition to their inventions and falsehood) of the glory of His incorruptible Word: and this I do, that by His own uncompromising mouth it may ultimately be established, who within the pale of these Churches have KNOWINGLY been the champions of error; and who—single-handed albeit, yet through His own upholding Spirit all-sufficient—has effectually bucklered eternal Truth from spoliation. There cometh a day, be sure, (I shall see it—but not now; I shall behold it—but not nigh!) when there shall be a second but purely protestant exhibition of the drama, *of one against the hundred thousand of Israel*: for it is written, “Fear them not therefore; for there is nothing covered, that shall not be revealed; and *hid*, that shall not be known:” (Matt. x. 26): and again, “Every man’s work shall be made manifest; for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed, *by fire*; and the fire (*that is, of Jehovah’s dross consuming rectitude!*) shall try every man’s work of what sort it is.” (1 Cor. iii. 13.) On the strength of this awfully solemn verity, to the innocent who have been made to err, I say, “*How long halt ye between two opinions? if the Lord be God, FOLLOW HIM: but if Baal, then FOLLOW HIM.*” (1 Kings viii. 21.)

CHAPTER III.

THAT ETERNAL PRINCIPLE, ON WHICH IN HIS EVANGELICAL DEALING WITH THE NON-ELECT THE PROCEDURE OF JEHOVAH IS BASED, UNFOLDED : AND THE IMPOSSIBILITY THAT THE ACCIDENT OF THE FALL SHOULD AVAIL TO ANNIHILATE ANY PART OF THE MORAL OBLIGATION INCUMBENT ON CREATURE OR CREATOR, DEMONSTRATED.

IN the first chapter of the argument for the case of Jehovah I have from abounding scriptural evidence proved, not merely the augmented responsibility which by virtue of the gospel of Christ accrues to the non-elect, but that that responsibility is, first, for deliberate rejection of a freely proffered clemency, and secondly, for causeless hate of the divine Persons by whom that clemency is tendered. In chapter second, I have removed from the path of the P. R. Baptist brethren that stumblingstone, which by the term "SPIRITUAL ACTIONS," had too recklessly been set for their falling. And now in accordance with the arrangement which I have chosen, it falls to me to unfold the august principle by which, in His evangelical dealings with the non-elect, Jehovah sees fit to be guided.

In contradistinction to the exceedingly unjust proposition, "That because of a sinful disability in the non-elect to obey, the Lord has no right to do that which He actually *has* done," I shall in this chapter take occasion to show, that God *has* a right—an altogether unchallengeable and just right—to do *precisely* as He has done. For if according to the nicest principle of equity He had not had that right, He never would (for by moral nature He is too infinitely exalted) have persisted in so strenuously asserting it.

Reverting then to an era, which for lack of terms more befitting we are accustomed to designate the beginning,—recalling that inconceivable period of repose in which the heavens and the earth were not, neither lived, loved, nor exulted angel, nor spirit,—and what, be it asked, do we find? Both infinity and eternity, as considered apart from God, undarkened by the shadow of a RIGHT. Right was not, except as by everlasting inheritance that pertained to God. It met, centered, found exclusive representation in Him ; and apart from His august, His incomprehensible Being, had no vestige, no sign of existence. Before the heavens and the earth, therefore,—before angel, or spirit, or man,—the will, sovereign and arbitrary of the Deity, and that alone, is seen to have been the fountain-head,—sole spring, sublime and solitary, of right.

What next? In the long sweeping line of ages came at length a time, when the self-existent—sole-existent—I AM, determined on the heavens and the earth ; the being of angels, pure spirits, and man. And because to will and to do were his right, therefore

have we the heavens and the earth, the intelligent souls of angels, pure spirits, and men. Pursuing still further His lofty prerogative, immediately on the creation of these moral, these accountable beings, it pleased Jehovah to determine their endowment with befitting creature rights. Hence to each, according to his order, a high heritage of moral right. But since, by very nature of the case, the right of the creature was exceedingly liable to abuse, it pleased God as a true and infallible standard by which to test the use or abuse of such right, to frame, arm with authority, and set over the intelligent creature of His hand, a divine law. By which law, through the wisdom of God, the befitting right thus beneficently accorded the creature, was justly limited. That is, the divine law, as vicegerent or representative of Jehovah, was, to such extent as in His infinite wisdom the Lawgiver deemed meet, armed with power to restrict within equitable limits the free exercise of that right, to the enjoyment of which the intelligent creature had been called. Thus the range of that right which had been bestowed on the creature, extended to the bound of the law's righteous sanction ; but not beyond. It is clear, therefore, that these two subordinate rights—the right of the law and of the creature—are not equal ; but the former, greatly superior to the latter.

We have now before us three distinct rights, which, counting from the lower to the higher, stand thus. First, the great yet subordinate right benignantly vouchsafed to the creature,—and by the requirements of equity necessarily restricted : secondly, the divinely delegated and greatly superior right of the law,—ordained to secure that limitation of creature right which was in equity so imperatively demanded : and thirdly, the undervived or sovereign right of the Supreme Ruler,—from which, as source and sole fountain of inferior right, the vested rights of the law and creature do spring. And here, with a view to ensure to the reader a clear understanding of the argument which is to follow, I call his special attention to the fact, that if of the above two rights so greatly superior to the right of the creature, viz., that of the law and of the Deity, the less, or right of the law, be altogether *inalienable*, then, by the same rule, the greater, or right of the Supreme Ruler, must (but in a sense infinitely more exalted) also be *inalienable*.

But leaving now the consideration of mere right, and approaching the grave, the deeply momentous question of moral obligation, let the reader be pleased to observe : That in the case of the Supreme Ruler, the true source and sole fountain of right, except *only* that obligation in which for the exalting of his own transcendent moral excellency He vouchsafes to be held—in other

words, that obligation in which for the manifesting of the dazzling lustre of His own intrinsic rectitude He condescends to be bound—there is absolutely none. To suppose obligation on the part of God other than this—other than by the claims of His own ineffably glorious being imposed—is, to speak plainly, to misapprehend the nature and very principle of Deity. So much for obligation in connection with God. Secondly, with regard to obligation as incumbent on the law, let the reader be pleased to mark, that so far as perfectly effecting the original purpose of Jehovah is concerned, to wit, restraining within equitable limits the exercise of subordinate right by the creature, the obligation of the law is imperative: there *may*, there *must be*, no failure. That obligation is very clearly set forth as follows: to wit, from the first moment of its institution, and onward, its office was—to restrain to the bound of its sanction the free exercise of right by the creature; or in case of that sanction's violation, eternally doom for the breach. So much for obligation, as considered in connexion with the law. Thirdly, with reference to obligation as weightily resting on the creature, be it said, that if according to the immediately foregoing proposition, the obligation of the law to secure the original purpose of Jehovah was imperative—was to restrain to the bound of its sanction the free exercise of right by the creature—then, indisputably, the obligation resting on the creature was, in the free exercise of that subordinate right with which in the beneficence of God he stood endowed, to walk wisely within the law's holy sanction. So much for moral obligation on the part of the creature.

I have now gathered up and set in order, not merely three distinct and inalienable rights, but as many indestructible or eternal obligations. First, the unchallengable right of Jehovah to act freely at the good pleasure of His will: but not only that, His imperative obligation beside, to manifest to the very uttermost His intrinsic moral excellency—magnify before his angels the essential rectitude of the divine nature. Secondly, the delegated right of the law to restrain to the bound of its sanction the free exercise of right by the creature: but not only that, its absolute obligation beside, in the event of that sanction's violation everlastingly to doom for the breach. And thirdly, the subordinate and gratuitously enjoyed right of the creature, to walk at liberty within the bound of the law's sanction: but not only that, his inextinguishable obligation beside, as a moral and accountable being, to eschew the wickedness of attempting, through disregard, to tread that illustrious sanction beneath his feet.

Having made manifest the several rights and obligations involved, which, if there is to be a radical understanding of this

case it is absolutely indispensable to keep in view, that which next claims to be considered is, *the peculiarity of the circumstance under which these exist*. With regard then to the several rights in question, mark, that they exist by a necessity IN EQUITY, or in other words, because in the nature of things moral, there is a natural or intrinsic comeliness in them. By which is meant, first, that since in the very nature of things it was comely, that the constitution over which God was to preside should be moral, it was necessary that the intelligent creature of God's hand should be free ; hence, necessary that according to its distinctive order, it should be invested with befitting creature rights : secondly, that since such befitting creature rights were to be bestowed, not upon infallible beings who cannot err, but fallible who possibly may, it was also a comely thing, that as a standard of rectitude a law with fitting sanctions and endowed with delegated right to require for those sanctions respect, should be framed and by authority set before them : and thirdly, that since this befitting creature right, and this ordinance of law for the just regulating of its exercise, were in order to a moral constitution absolutely necessary, it still further became a comely thing, that in the free exercise of His sovereign right Jehovah should decree these things. From which considerations, it may now very clearly be discerned, that all this, having as is undeniable by God been done—done with design to magnify in the general assembly of His intelligent creatures His own eternal excellency—it has been done in strict accordance with that majestic moral principle to which above I have particularly alluded. The incontrovertible conclusion therefore is, that that befitting but necessarily circumscribed right of the free creature, that delegated and necessarily greatly superior controlling right of the law, and that free exercise of supreme or divine right in which such befitting right of the creature and controlling right of the law have existence, do each and all stand in one grand everlasting principle, to wit, the high, the majestic principle of equity. For the things in question, be it observed, already have actual existence ; but except for their strict accordance with the sublime principle to which I have pointed, the immaculate holiness of the nature of Jehovah is the guarantee, that they had never, nay ! never had being.

Now if, as I trust on incontrovertible evidence I have proved, the grand principle of equity above cited, be the excellency in consonance with which Jehovah has ordained that moral constitution under which is the obligation of the creature—and if, speaking in a sense purely ethical, that principle be an essential element of the Divine Nature,—then, the Divine Nature being itself immutable, the principle which is an essential element of that Nature,

must also be immutable. And if in consonance with this immutable principle of an immutable Divine Nature, Jehovah have set up that moral constitution under which are the several obligations to which reference has been, then, both the principle and the Divine Nature according to which that moral constitution takes its rise, being immutable, so of necessity must the constitution and the several obligations which are under that constitution, inevitably be.

I have now formed and fashioned the instrument, by which, even to its base, to shatter that false argument which on the strength of rationalistic surmise has been set up. That is, first, as to the matter of right, I have shown, that the right of God is by natural, or personal, or eternal inheritance, consequently, incapable of annihilation; that the right of the law is by the Divine Will delegated, consequently, equally incapable of annihilation; and, that the right of the creature is by the same Divine Will vouchsafed, consequently, as much as the former, incapable of annihilation. Secondly, with respect to the matter of moral obligation, I have shown, that inseparable from the parties to whom these several rights pertain, exist under that moral constitution which in the wisdom of the Deity has been established, respective obligations: of God, to glorify the divine moral excellency; of the Law, to secure the ends of the moral constitution established; and of the creature, to revere those high ends, and the law thus instituted to secure them. Thirdly, as to the root of the moral constitution established, I have shown, that it is after the eternal principle of equity, or the intrinsic comeliness naturally pertaining to things moral,—which principle, is also an essential element of the Divine Nature. And lastly, with regard to the several obligations existent under that moral constitution which has been established, I have, I assume, very clearly shown, that forasmuch as both the principle and the Divine Nature according to which that moral constitution takes its rise, are immutable, therefore, inevitably, THE SEVERAL OBLIGATIONS WHICH ARE UNDER THAT CONSTITUTION, ARE EQUALLY AND ETERNALLY IMMUTABLE.

By the force of these incontrovertible truths, the whole rationalistic argument of those who impugn the evangelical dealings of God with the non-elect, is to the very core vitiated: given over to perpetual derision. That this may appear, in full blaze of the light of these facts, I proceed to cast a glance on the solemn accident of the fall. It will now very clearly be seen, that that dread transaction neither has—nor by any conceivable stretch of imagination can be supposed to have—power to change or to modify, that wise, that most just course of action, which Jehovah has seen fit to adopt. For if it be granted that the several facts

recorded are insuperable, then, under no circumstances whatever can the moral obligation *incumbent on either of the parties concerned*, in the least vary, or cease: that of each, in its integrity, abides steadfast for ever. In plain phrase, nothing can relieve the creature from his filial obligation to walk humbly within the sanction of the law; nothing relieve the law from its imperative obligation to require due respect for its sanction, or eternally condemn for the breach; nothing (I speak in the sense of rectitude or equity alone) relieve the Supreme Ruler from the high, the imperial obligation, of glorifying in the presence of His creatures the transcendent excellency of His moral being. These several obligations, under any, under every circumstance, **MUST ENDURE**: for it is simply fit, that is, morally right, **THAT THEY SHOULD**.

Upon these just grounds, and in immediate connexion with **THE FALL**, I now proceed to lay down an impregnable proposition. Let the reader specially mark it; for upon this, as upon a stone of flint, I break to fragments both the false theology and the rationalistic error of the opponents of apostolic practice. This then is my proposition,—That if the several rights above exhibited, to wit, of the Supreme Ruler, the law, and the creature, be indeed as has been shewn, inalienable, and if as a consequence, the **MORAL OBLIGATION** attendant on each be absolutely or eternally indestructible, then, it is clear, that to the end of the world and of time, *no mere accident which may chance to transpire*, can by any possibility avail to cancel **THAT MORAL OBLIGATION**. But if this be granted, then, it follows and is self-evident, that neither the accident of **THE FALL**, nor an aggregate of ten thousand such accidents, can in the slightest degree avail to modify—far less to cancel or annul. Of which fact, the several plain issues are these. First, that the *original* obligation of the creature to walk within the righteous sanction of the law, must, under any and every circumstance, **THE CIRCUMSTANCE OF THE FALL INCLUSIVE**, remain the same. And secondly, that the *original* obligation of the law, as the vicegerent of Jehovah to restrict the exercise of right by the creature to the bound of its own holy sanction, must also, under any and every circumstance, **THE CIRCUMSTANCE OF THE FALL INCLUSIVE**, abide the same. And thirdly, that the *original* obligation of Jehovah to magnify His own moral excellency—exalt to the uttermost His natural or intrinsic perfection—must as certainly, under any and every circumstance, **THE CIRCUMSTANCE OF THE FALL INCLUSIVE**, remain the same. Upon the strength of this immutability of obligation, therefore, I assume leave once and for ever to lay it down, that since that *particular accident* to which I have now pointed, to wit, the trans-

gression in Eden and constitutional corruption consequent thereupon, has no power whatever upon the original obligation of the creature, on that of the eternal law, or that of the Supreme Ruler, therefore, IN THE CASE OF EACH, AND IN SPITE OF THE FALL, SUCH OBLIGATION MUST OF NECESSITY REMAIN.

By force of this adamant conclusion—conclusion which as upon a rock I have set up—I am now in a position to grind to powder the TREASONABLE TENET of the antagonists of apostolic practice. This work of grinding, therefore, I shall for the sake of perspicuity execute first : afterwards, in judicial righteousness, I shall give to scorn the false theology which is in the treasonable tenet involved.

The tenet, then, which in the course of providence it falls to my hand to grind to powder, is,—“That by reason of the fall, and that radical state of sinfulness, or moral disability which results from it, JEHOVAH HAS NO LONGER JUST RIGHT TO CALL HIS CREATURES, TO WIT, INTELLIGENT WRONG DOERS OF THE NON-ELECT TO REPENTANCE.” Expressed in other words,—“Because man has fallen, and by the fall brought himself into a state of sin,—state of constitutional disinclination to all that is right, heart-aptitude to all that is wrong, therefore, THAT FACT SUFFICES TO ANNIHILATE ALL JUST CLAIM ON THE PART OF THE SUPREME RULER TO DO THAT WHICH BY HIS SON, HIS WORD, AND HIS APOSTLES HE ACTUALLY HAS DONE. “For repentance,” say these super-eminently wise parties, “is a *spiritual act* ; and since natural men cannot be expected to perform *spiritual acts*, therefore, Jehovah has no shadow of just right to call non-elect wrong doers to repentance : it would be useless, unjust, trifling with men, and mere mockery.” Such the highly indecorous, nay ! the absolutely contumacious and offensive argument, which has by the antagonists of the divine wisdom and rectitude been exalted. To this false judgment of the judges, therefore, I now proceed to apply those irrefutable truths, THE WHICH, as with lead in the rock, I have on the foregoing pages recorded.

If then man's fall through transgression, and that involvement in constitutional depravity which is the consequence of it, be of virtue to disinherit the Supreme Ruler of his sovereign right, then, by the very same rule, man's fall by sin, and involvement in constitutional depravity, must also be of virtue to divest of its delegated right the Law. For these two rights, though distinct, stand upon one and the same ground, to wit, the sheer supremacy of the Deity. But the Supreme Ruler, be it observed, is infinitely greater than the Law : hence, if as in the preceding pages shewn, the right of the latter, the Law, be altogether inalienable, far more so, unquestionably, that of the former, The Supreme Ruler.

But were it possible that the fall of the creature into sin, and his consequent subjection under moral corruption, should avail to annihilate the right of God which is greater, of necessity would those things be all-sufficient, to annul that of the Law which is less : if fatal to the sovereign right and transcendent obligation of the Lawgiver, most assuredly even more fatal to the delegated right and greatly inferior obligation of His holy Law. These two things, then, the sovereign right and exalted obligation of Jehovah, and the delegated right and much inferior obligation of the Law, as may now be clearly seen, must of necessity stand or fall, sink or swim, together. Were it in connexion with the creature possible, to devise a circumstance of sufficient force to disinherit of His sovereign right, divest of His high obligation Jehovah, that circumstance would infallibly be of force, to divest of its delegated right, release from its far humbler obligation the Law. Because, if upon *any conceivable ground*, arbitrary or circumstantial, the former, which by an infinite degree is greater, may either be set aside or as a light thing annihilated, then, upon the very same ground may the latter, which by a corresponding degree is less, be subjected to the same indignity. Does the Holy Scripture then in any place, or does common sense which is immeasurably lower, at all subscribe to such possibility ? If it can clearly be shewn that it does not, then, by all parties it must of necessity be granted, that notwithstanding the fatal accident of the fall, notwithstanding also the involvement of the whole human race in moral corruption, of which again the effect is sinful disinclination to all that is good, yet the Supreme Ruler has the most unchallengeable right to summon the wrong-doer to that which is equitable, viz., TO REPENTANCE.

With a view therefore to place this grand fact in the clearest, the most striking light, I submit the question,—Because of the accident of the fall, does the immutable, the eternal law of God, in order to excuse, favour, or accommodate in sin the ruined, the constitutionally corrupt race of Adam, in whole, or in any particular part, either diminish in its divinely delegated right to respect ? or renounce its imperative obligation to condemn ? Let those who deny the evangelical purpose of Jehovah in the non-elect answer. If however with good reason they are compelled to reply, ‘Nay,’ then, relying upon rationalistic deduction, might I not with great show of candour and plausibility respond, ‘But my reason, my every-day experience also, ay ! and the Bible beside unitedly give me to understand, that the corrupt offspring of Adam have no holy will, no dispositional adaptation, no desire, taste, ambition,—in one word, no pure moral principle whatever, that they should delight to obey : therefore, for the divine Law to require

at their hand that obedience to which, through corrupting their nature they have rendered themselves both unwilling and unequal, is unjust, absurd, useless: I therefore see fit to demand, that from all obligation to obey the holy, the just, the eternal law of God, they be, for their wickedness' sake, freely and for ever discharged. Now because of such carnal argumentation on my part, Will the holy, the eternal, the inviolable Law of God, by subjection, give place for a moment to iniquity? Will it to excuse, abet, favour, accommodate in sin the corrupt offspring of Adam, approve my unhallowed argument; or consent that from all moral obligation under the law, the children of men be set free? It is of necessity answered, 'Nay; not for a moment.' The case of the law therefore being established, I turn to that of the Supreme Ruler. If by reason of the inalienable character of that merely delegated right with which in the wisdom of God his law has been invested, the case of the Law be so, then, I venture to submit, Is not the underived, the sovereign right of the Supreme Ruler—of Him who is Himself the sole fountain of delegated right—even *more* sacred, *more* inalienable still? It is, I assume, granted. Let the reader therefore mark what follows. On the strength of that sacred, that inalienable right, the Lord, for a particular purpose which I shall shortly explain, felt an obligation to send forth His gospel to the non-elect; the call of that gospel being, as in the first chapter for the case of Jehovah I have even to superfluity proved, "*Repent ye; and believe on the Lord Jesus Christ.*" But say those who oppose apostolic practice, 'Our reason, our every-day experience also, ay! and the Bible beside unitedly give us to understand, that the corrupt offspring of Adam have no holy will, no dispositional adaptation, no desire, taste, ambition,—in a word, no pure moral principle whatever, that they should delight to obey: therefore, for the Supreme Ruler to require at their hand that repentance and faith to which, through corrupting themselves they have become both unwilling and unequal, is unjust, absurd, useless, nay! trifling with them, tauntingly, and with apparent sincerity commanding them to do impossibilities: we therefore see fit to demand, that from all obligation to obey the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ, they be, for their wickedness' sake, most freely and completely discharged.' Now because of such carnal argumentation by those who deny Jehovah's evangelical purpose in the non-elect, will the Supreme Ruler, by subjection, give place for a moment to iniquity? Will He to excuse, abet, favour, accommodate in sin the corrupt offspring of Adam, approve this rationalistic argument; or consent that from open exposure, first, of their rejection of proffered clemency, and secondly, their hate of the Divine Persons by whom

that clemency is tendered, the children of men be set free? It must of necessity—in defiance of prejudice itself—be responded, ‘Nay.’ For if notwithstanding the fall, and consequent subjection of the human soul under moral corruption, the delegated right of the Law remains sacred and inalienable, much more, of a truth, must the underived and sovereign right of the Supreme Ruler which is greater, in its sacredness, its inalienableness, remain. And if by consent of the Law, that righteous requirement at the hand of the non-elect which is under the law, shall *not* for man’s fall and involvement in moral corruption be abolished nor in anywise diminished; so likewise by consent of the Supreme Ruler, shall not that righteous requirement at the hand of the non-elect which is under the gospel, *be*, for man’s fall and involvement in moral corruption, either contravened, or have its end in the slightest defeated. For if according to the strictest principle of equity, the fallen, the depraved condition of man, *be*, as a plea for annihilating the delegated right of the law, altogether and eternally disallowed; so likewise as a plea for annihilating the underived and sovereign right of the Supreme Ruler, the fallen, depraved condition of man is, according to the strictest principle of the same incorruptible equity, absolutely and for ever rejected. But one conclusion remains: to wit, that notwithstanding the accident of the fall, notwithstanding also that involvement of the non-elect in sin which is its consequence, the divinely delegated right of the Law to restrain the exercise of right by the creature within the bound of its sanction, and its imperative obligation for contempt of that sanction to condemn, do for ever in their integrity abide; while notwithstanding the same accident of the fall, the same corrupt moral condition of the non-elect, the sovereign right of the Supreme Ruler over them, and that high and imperial obligation to call to repentance in which for an absolutely indispensable purpose He stands bound, do in like manner everlastingly remain.

From the indestructible rights and concomitant obligations here enumerated, I have now demonstrated the highly contumacious character of the assumption, *that it is NOT TO THE SUPREME RULER COMPETENT TO COMMAND, that repentance toward God, and faith in Christ Jesus for the remission of sin, BE IN HIS GREAT NAME PREACHED TO THE NON-ELECT.* The unchallengeable right of Jehovah therefore to do as He *has done*, having on absolutely unassailable evidence been established, in order to complete this chapter vindicative of the divine prerogative it remains but to shew, what that high and holy obligation is, under which in doing as He has done the Sovereign of the Universe stood bound. When the several heads of divine wisdom in the Lord’s procedure

have been apprehended, their deep design laid to heart and digested, the evangelical case of the non-elect in its unutterable momentousness and solemnity, will I trust to some extent be appreciated.

But in examining this question of divine obligation—obligation by which in justice to Himself Jehovah stood bound—let that which in the shape of a celestial axiom has been laid down, be ever steadfastly borne in mind; to wit, that in the case of the Supreme Ruler, such obligation consists, and can only consist in a righteous adherence to that, which for the sake of vindicating the exalted excellency of His own nature is absolutely necessary; or in other words, that which for the glorification of His own essential rectitude, is by the case necessarily and imperatively demanded. In short, it is to be held, that moral obligation as it relates to God, is bounded, exclusively, by the high claims of His most venerable Being.

With this fundamental proposition full in view, let the reader now be pleased to mark, that according to a certain lofty “NEED BE,” the most sublime (if the phrase may be granted me) in equity, but upon which for lack of space I am here precluded from entering, the vast body of the non-elect have in the Covenant of Grace been passed by,—that is, have not been predestined to the unspeakably glorious inheritance of the elect. In language plainer still, these parties have not from eternity been appointed to the exalted blessings of indissoluble union with the Incarnate Son—eternal life in Him—and that effectual grace of the Holy Spirit through which the naturally dead, corrupt, disobedient heart of the fall, is, despite its natural hardness and ungodliness, renewed unto repentance, faith, and sanctification. Though with no more original sin, and in many cases a much less measure of actual than their more highly favoured fellows, they have not been included in that Covenant of special mercies called Covenant of Grace, *that under the altogether extraordinary stretch of prerogative peculiar to that Covenant*, they also in the power of an endless or divine life should be renewed; but contrariwise, have been left to the way of their own choice on earth—to judgment and just retribution hereafter. This awful distinction, as above stated, is by virtue of the very loftiest principle in accordance with which Jehovah deigns to have His actions—principle involving issues the most stupendous—reaching to the noblest interests of the whole undefiled portion of His moral and intellectual creation. But, unimpeachable to the uttermost, though this high principle to which I refer unquestionably is, the fact *may* not and *cannot* nevertheless be disputed, that that tremendous, that altogether fearful distinction between man and man, creature and fellow-creature which is the consequence of it, must infallibly, when from a creature

point of view regarded, appear dark, confounding, terrible. For in discriminating between these and those, the inscrutable wisdom of Jehovah regards no relationship, recognizes no creature excellencies, respects no ties: separating between nearest and dearest, nay! oftentimes causing these in particular to be arrayed on opposite sides in the judgment. With reference to which awful fact, it is said to the Church—the Virgin—the Daughter of Zion,—“Hearken, O daughter, and consider, and incline thine ear; FORGET ALSO THINE OWN PEOPLE, AND THY FATHER’S HOUSE; so shall the king greatly desire thy beauty: for he is thy Lord; and worship thou him.” (Ps. xlv. 10, 11.)

Unreflecting natures, hearts devoid of true sensibility on the one hand, and reckless, soul-seared Antinomian doctrinists on the other, may, and doubtless will, affect superiority to this fact: but every tender, every sensitive spirit will be constrained to admit, that the case is as I have represented. Moreover, through lack in the creature of that all-penetrating light which is the distinctive excellency of Mind Divine,—absence of a perfect or even comprehensive view of the magnificent purposes of Jehovah,—disability likewise to trace the moral working and ultimate issues of those purposes,—the exclusive tendency of the appalling distinction to which I have drawn attention is, to excite or generate in the bosom both of the ransomed and the angelic creature, incorrect conclusions with regard to the nature and heart of the Deity. In plain words, the whole influence, tendency, power, (name it by what term you will), of the unutterably solemn act of election, so long as in its seeming hardness, its apparently high-handed arbitrariness, standing naked and solitarily before the mind, is, and must necessarily be, to beget and perpetuate in the heart of the creature involuntary conceptions with respect to Jehovah: conceptions of a character radically wrong: the ideas of ill-will, personal vindictiveness, and revengeful triumph. But this, manifestly is, in the absence of all real or just ground, for the acts of election and judgment to operate in large measure to the prejudice of the glory of the divine nature. Because then of this tendency—tendency through the very weakness of mind finite under the circumstances inevitable—the Lord apprehended it to be an obligation in which for the glory of His great name He stood bound, to take such measures in connection with this case, as should effectually vindicate in the hearts of all holy intelligences the transcendent excellency of the divine nature; its essential goodness; infinite distance from the dispositions which might, through force of the acts OF ELECTION AND JUDGMENT, have been suspected and inadvertently imputed.

Be it observed, then, that it is an absolute fact—fact pre-

eminently demonstrative of the transcendent lustre of the divine moral glory—that notwithstanding all the causeless hate, gratuitous rebellion, unconcealed contempt of the wicked, the heart of Jehovah ABIDES VOID OF THE SPIRIT OF MALICE, FREE FROM ALL THIRST OF REVENGE. It is *not* through an indwelling malice, is *not* from fell thirst of revenge, that the enemies of Jehovah, called sometimes in theological treatises non-elect, sometimes reprobate, have in the decree of election been passed over, or in the judgment irrevocably damned. So far from its having transpired through dispositions base and low as these, the facts are, first, that their not having been ordained to the same blessings as the church elect of the Lord Jesus Christ, is, as I have said, by stress of a requirement the most lofty in equity; while, secondly, with respect to their final, their everlasting damnation, it is the simple meed—judicial award—of their own sin: from award of which, on ground righteous and just, they have shewn no disposition, no desire to recede. Anticipating therefore His ultimate, His inevitable judicial dealing with the non-elect—their condemnation under sin, and eternal banishment from the divine presence and glory—the Lord has deemed it in the highest degree necessary, that this fact of His entire freedom from malice, fact so pre-eminently demonstrative of the excellency of His moral being, should not only be authoritatively witnessed, but through positive, *ay!* practical demonstration, incontestably and eternally substantiated. Hence, first of all, by the breath of His Spirit in prophet and apostle, the Lord has not been negligent to declare it. Moreover, that the momentous character of this truth might appear, He has not even deemed it too much to assert it on oath by the lips of His ancient seer Ezekiel. It is written,—“Say unto them,” (let the reader remember that save in an *evangelical sense* it is absolutely impossible to Jehovah thus to speak), “*As I live*, saith the Lord God, I have NO PLEASURE in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live: turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways; for why will ye die, O house of Israel:” (xxxiii. 11.): and again,—“Have I ANY PLEASURE AT ALL that the wicked should die? saith the Lord God: and not that he should return from his ways and live?”: and yet again,—“For I have NO PLEASURE in the death of him that dieth, saith the Lord God: wherefore turn yourselves, and live ye.” (Ibid xviii. 23, 32.) But not content with having at the mouth of the prophet asserted this fact in the Old Testament, Jehovah once more by the pen of His leading apostle, the man Peter, takes occasion to re-assert and corroborate it in the New. It is written,—“The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness; but” (remember that only in an *evangelical sense*

can this be recorded by the Spirit) "is longsuffering to usward, NOT WILLING that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance." (2 Pet. iii. 9.) The same grand truth, and almost in the same terms, is by the great Apostle of the Gentiles, Paul, confirmed to the heathen world. He says,—“Or” (but again be it remembered that what follows can only be predicated of God on *evangelical* ground) “despisest thou the riches of his goodness and forbearance and longsuffering; not knowing that THE GOODNESS OF GOD LEADETH THEE TO REPENTANCE? But after thy hardness and impenitent heart *treasures up* unto thyself wrath (that is, makest the very gospel to be to thyself a savour of death unto death) against the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment of God.” (Rom. ii. 4, 5.)

Next let the reader take special note, that because with an infinite jealousy burning for His glory in this respect, therefore, not even content with declaring the fact under consideration upon oath, nor yet with His subsequent emphatic reiterations of it in the New Testament, the Lord in His infinite wisdom has still further judged—that as a something in every way comely—an act of justice in the very highest due to Himself—a procedure to the uttermost befitting, decorous, indispensable—this grand peculiarity of the Eternal Mind, this entire absence in Himself of malice toward the guilty, the self-ruined creature, should against the day of judicial condemnation—day also of final and irrevocable damnation—be caused to stand in a practical demonstration. For this express purpose, therefore, the raising up in presence of the angelic and archangelic intelligences of such a practical and visible demonstration as should to the required end be effectual, it was absolutely necessary *that on conditions* SIMPLY AND STRICTLY EQUITABLE, *a free proffer of clemency should in the name of God be laid before the non-elect.* This clearing by practical demonstration of the ineffably pure nature of Jehovah—clearing from the remotest possibility of surmise or suspicion—being in the consummated drama of the mystery of iniquity essential to the moral grandeur of the Deity—equally necessary to the full complacency in that drama of the hosts upon hosts of intelligences in light—therefore in the exercise of that sovereign, that inalienable right, with which as Supreme Ruler He stands armed, *the Lord God upon the righteous ground of THE WORK OF HIS SON, did from eternity decree to set before the souls of the non-elect, wherever His gospel truth should be sent, A FREE PROFFER UPON EQUITABLE CONDITIONS OF LIFE.* Expressed otherwise, *Jehovah on the ground of AN ALL-SUFFICIENCY as by Himself apprehended IN THE WORK OF HIS SON, did from eternity pre-determine to place before a vast portion of His bitterest enemies of the non-elect, (BUT ON STRICTLY*

EQUITABLE CONDITIONS ALONE), *a free proffer of clemency or life*: to the end, that in that portion as a specimen or open example of the whole, it might be positively ay! beyond suspicion established, that NOT the awful distinction between man and man made by divine election, NOT any spirit of malice or thirst for revenge in the heart of God—NOT any lack of consideration or benevolence on His part—is that which cuts these parties off from clemency and life; but their own sad choice of sin—inveterate hatred of the Father and the Son—and suicidal rejection of the person and sceptre of Christ.

That this extraordinary criminality is in a sense the most unqualified, both chargeable and by Jehovah already charged upon those of the non-elect who hear only to despise the general call of the gospel, I adduce the following declaration at the lips of Christ. Which declaration, being through the stubbornness of its several clauses far too hard for the wresting of the most accomplished Jesuit, I freely invite the party most inveterately hostile to apostolic practice, either to explain it away, pervert, or evade. It is written,—“Jesus cried and said, He that believeth on me, believeth not on *me*, but on *him* that sent me. And he that seeth *me* seeth *him* that sent me. *I am come a light into the world, THAT WHOSOEVER BELIEVETH ON ME* should not abide in darkness. *And if ANY MAN hear my words, and BELIEVE NOT, I judge him not*: for I came not to judge the world, *but TO SAVE the world. He that REJECTETH ME, and receiveth not MY WORDS, hath one that judgeth him*: THE WORD THAT I HAVE SPOKEN, *the same shall judge him in the last day.* For I have not spoken of myself, but THE FATHER which sent me, HE GAVE ME A COMMANDMENT, *what I should say, and what I should speak. And I know that HIS COMMANDMENT IS LIFE EVERLASTING: whatsoever I speak therefore, EVEN AS THE FATHER SAID unto me, so I speak.* (John xii. 44—50. See also, Luke xix. 14, 27.)

Let the reader next with attention be pleased to mark, that in thus setting (but on conditions simply and entirely equitable) Christ and a proffer of life before the non-elect, those conditions which in the light of His infinite wisdom were by Jehovah adjudged to be of that character, were in number two: the first, *repentance* toward God, the second, *faith* in our Lord Jesus Christ.

With regard to these conditions—conditions on the ground of EQUITY ALONE chosen and ordained—be it said, first, that in setting a proffer of clemency or life before the creature that with recklessness has sinned—and by sin rendered itself obnoxious to legal penalty—Jehovah, *to the end that sin should neither be hugged nor retained*, discerned it to be absolutely indispensable in order to forgiveness, that the guilty party should REPENT OF HIS EVIL

WAY, AND WITH PURPOSE OF HEART TURN TO GOD. Having therefore in the light of His wisdom discerned this to be one condition under the circumstances equitable, the Lord on the strength of that sovereign prerogative which is His, saw fit in every ear to which in the course of providence the gospel of life should be sent, to *command repentance*. And secondly, in thus setting under the equitable condition of repentance a free proffer of life before these parties, Jehovah, in order to meet the event of repentance perceived it next to be indispensable, that by a call of the wrong doer to faith in the blood and righteousness of Christ, sufficient provision should be made for the actual removal of sin. Having for the perfecting of His divine proffer of life perceived this to be the second condition under the circumstances equitable, the Lord on the strength of that sovereign prerogative which as Supreme Ruler is inalienably His, saw fit in every ear to which in the course of providence the gospel should be sent, not merely to command repentance toward God, but *call to faith in Christ for the remission of sins*.

It is thus, that the conditions of repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, are found inseparably annexed to the gospel. These conditions are not simply arbitrary, but such as by the high principle of equity are imperatively demanded: hence, are not by the God of equity to be dispensed with. They are as stringent in the case of the elect as the non-elect: for He that is a God of equity over the latter, the same is God—hence a God of equity—over the former. The only difference in the case of the elect is this, that TO THEM HE IS ALSO A GOD OF GRACE; hence, in virtue of their actual purchase by the blood of Christ, He through the Eternal Spirit grants them that divine quickening by which, the equitable conditions inseparable from His gospel are in their solemnity, first, apprehended—secondly, felt—and thirdly, under befitting humiliation of soul brought to pass. This grand fact, to wit, that the indispensable conditions—conditions in equity inseparable from the bestowment of life upon the guilty—are as uncompromising in the case of the elect as the non-elect, will, to every intelligent mind, at once and satisfactorily account for the imperial mandate to preach the gospel indiscriminately to the mass. For in the case of the elect the preaching of repentance and faith is absolutely necessary, that by obedience *through grace* to these equitable requirements they may be saved. And in the case of the non-elect the preaching of repentance and faith is equally indispensable, that by their openly manifested disobedience to these most equitable requirements it may be practically demonstrated, that NOT by that grave distinction between man and man which is made by divine election,—NOT by any malice,

or thirst of revenge in the heart of Jehovah,—NOT by any lack of benevolence on His part are these parties cut off from life and salvation ; but, rather, by their own act in rejecting on equitable terms the divine proffer of life, and their deep and invincible hatred of the Father and the Son ; in which gratuitous hate, through God's free interposition of the proffer of life by Christ Jesus, they are left absolutely without cloak or excuse.

The preaching therefore of those equitable conditions, which in connexion with the guilty and rebellious necessarily accompany a free proffer of life, being as imperative in the case of the elect as that of the non-elect, and vice versâ, the Son of God by that express mandate, "*Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature,*" did abundantly empower to this work all His faithful ministering servants in the ancient day. But not only so : for by causing, through the Spirit, this identical mandate to be recorded, He has graciously bequeathed us *that* which with the greatest propriety might be called a *glass*, in which to the end of time to behold, what was the mind, the will of Jehovah, with respect to the masses in the apostolic age. And since the mind and will of the immutable Jehovah in the ancient day, must in order to the validity of the immutability of that Holy One be the mind and will of the immutable Jehovah in the present day, it is evident, that as far as the grand work of indiscriminately preaching repentance and faith to the masses is concerned, in whatever degree by imperial mandate of Jehovah the ministering servants of the gospel were empowered in the olden day, to the very same by that identical mandate are the ministering servants of Jehovah empowered now. Yea ! and even as the high priest, captain of the temple, and chief priests, had no scriptural warrant, no divine authority to forbid the ministering servants of Jehovah this work of indiscriminately preaching Christ to the masses in the olden day, (Acts v. 24—42), so likewise have those who take upon them to deny the Lord's evangelical purpose in the non-elect no scriptural warrant, no divine authority to forbid the ministering servants of Jehovah this work of indiscriminately preaching Christ to the masses now : for it is written,—“ How then shall they call on him in whom they have not believed ? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard ? and how shall they hear without a preacher ? . . . So then faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.” (Rom. x. 14, 17.)

Having now thoroughly refuted the assumption of those, who denying the equitable right of Jehovah to command the preaching of repentance and faith to the non-elect, seek to charge that act upon Him as a crime ; it only remains to me ere closing the present

chapter, to stigmatize with its own peculiar brand the FALSE THEOLOGY involved in the argument of these parties. This I trust I shall be able to effect within the compass of a few brief sentences.

Their argument, the false theology of which I impugn, is this,—That because man has sinned, fallen into a state of moral corruption, and brought himself under wicked disinclination both to will and to do justly, therefore Jehovah has no longer right to require of him the comely acts of repentance and faith: TO DO SO HAS BECOME TO HIM INEQUITABLE. Such the fallacious reasoning; and such the highly irreverent decree. Now the false character of the theology here involved, is briefly but very accurately set forth as follows: That by this unscriptural, this altogether rationalistic argument it is substantially asserted,—*That a CONTINGENCY OF TIME IS OF VIRTUE TO MAKE VOID A PRINCIPLE OF ETERNITY—the ACCIDENT OF THE FALL TO BAR THE COURSE OF DIVINE EQUITY—the sheer WICKEDNESS OF THE CREATURE TO FRUSTRATE THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF THE CREATOR.* This theology is false. For by every discriminating mind it may at a single glance be seen, that if the liberty of Jehovah to act equitably is by the deliberate treason of the creature to be annihilated, then, SIN HOLDS THE SCEPTRE AND THE DEITY BECOMES ITS SLAVE. In contradistinction however to all such false theology, false morality, and false judgment, stands the fact, that as far as His own actions, personal and public are concerned, the Lord undeviatingly and persistently regulates them by the high principle of rectitude—REGARDLESS OF CONSEQUENCES. The mere accident of a creature's fall, a creature's wickedness, a creature's disability, cannot, *does not*, no! not for a moment, divert Him from the strict line of that principle: He pursues it as steadfastly when His creatures fall, as when they stand. Hence the fall of the creature, in other words, the deliberate transgression of the sinner, has not, as the opponents of apostolic practice delight to assert, *virtue to deprive Jehovah of the right to act equitably*: but contrariwise, despite the fall of His creatures, and to the confusion of every creature that through choice of transgression offends, THE RIGHT OF JEHOVAH TO ACT EQUITABLY REMAINS.

But enough! On the strength of these two splendid truths, to wit, the equal indestructibility of the right of the law and the Deity—and the eternal obligation of Jehovah to vindicate before the angelic intelligences, whose heritage it is, the glory of his Moral Being—I have now established the following most indisputable conclusions: first, that because of an imperative necessity *in which* for the clearing of His exalted nature He stood bound,

it was to Jehovah absolutely indispensable to command, that the gospel of life be preached to the non-elect ; and secondly, that from His lofty position as Supreme Ruler—primordial Fountain, sole Source of all right—it was not only competent to Him to require at the hand of the wrong doer repentance, but to make due provision for that event, by calling to faith in Christ for the remission of sin. By the weight of the said splendid truths then, as now clearly and incontrovertibly unfolded, I have here as between millstones ground to powder, the false, the abominable assertion, that it is not to the Supreme Ruler competent—is not to Him who is Himself the deep soul of equity, just—to do that which by his Son, his chosen Apostles, and his inspired Word, He actually has done : viz., *upon the equitable conditions of repentance towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, set before wrong doers both of the elect and non-elect, a free proffer of clemency and life.*

Thus much then, to sum up, in contradistinction to the unwarrantable assertions of those who rely on the deductions of natural reason, do I in the name of God most unyieldingly maintain, to wit, That in whatever degree the Holy Scriptures assert the present efficacy and everlasting stability of the right of the Law, in equal, or even greater degree do they maintain the present efficacy and eternal stability of the sovereign right of Jehovah. And if, as is nowhere disputed, the right of the Law over the non-elect be indestructible, then nowhere may the fact be disputed, that the right of the Supreme Ruler over the same parties is even more indestructible. For the law, is a mere instrument of moral government ; ordained with design to secure on the part of the intelligent creature righteousness. But the Supreme Ruler is monarch of the Law ; its Framer ; and He, the glory of whose divine nature is public property ; the inheritance of innumerable armies—even legions upon legions of pure spirits—the undefiled, the ever glorious seraphim. If therefore the right and the imperative obligation of the mere instrument, the Law, be so sacred, so altogether inviolable, that they cannot by the fall and corruption of the creature be annihilated ; then, infinitely more so, unquestionably, the imperial right and all-transcendent obligation of the Deity. Wherefore, if it be not oppressive but a comely and just thing, notwithstanding the fatality of the fall, notwithstanding the involvement of the creature in moral corruption, that the divine Law should assert undiminished its claim ; in like manner, neither is it oppressive but a comely and just thing, notwithstanding the fatality of the fall, notwithstanding also that involvement of the creature in moral corruption which is the consequence of it, that the great, the thrice adorable I AM—the august, the all-peerless Jehovah—should as a rich inherit-

ance for the hosts upon hosts of His holy ones, the innumerable companies of His seraphim in light, PRESERVE UNDIMMED IN ITS SPLENDOUR FOR EVER THE INEFFABLE LUSTRE OF HIS GLORIOUS MORAL BEING.

CHAPTER IV.

THAT HIGHLY IMPERFECT VIEW, WHICH IN CONTEMPLATING THE GRAND COVENANT OF SALVATION IS PECULIAR TO CALVINISTIC DIVINES, EXHIBITED: AND THE IMPOSSIBILITY THAT THE VOUCHSAFEMENT OF GRACE TO THE ELEFT SHOULD AVAIL TO EXCLUDE THE REQUIREMENTS OF EQUITY IN THE NON-ELEFT, DEMONSTRATED.

THE augmented responsibility of the non-elect through the preaching of the gospel, and just ground upon which that responsibility is decreed, having in chapter first of the case for Jehovah been established; the absurd theological error which is by opponents of the divine purpose brought against that responsibility, exploded in chapter second; and the indestructible nature (despite the fall) of the Lord's sovereign right over His erring creatures, irrefragably demonstrated in chapter third; it is evident, that what little specious show of foundation for their antisciptural practice has heretofore by the antagonists of revealed wisdom been boasted, is at length at a blow struck from beneath their feet. In order however to the perfecting of this refutation of rationalistic doctrine, two highly important points yet remain: the one, to make manifest that extremely defective view which by ultra-Calvinists in general—but especially those, the self-devised dogmas of whom I condemn—is taken of the ETERNAL COVENANTS: the other, to vindicate upon infallible testimony that, in which Jehovah sees fit absolutely to boast, to wit, the all-sufficiency of the Work of Christ, AS A RIGHTEOUS GROUND FOR THE PROGRESS OF THE DIVINE PURPOSES.

The order in which the above heads of argument are stated, being that in which to secure a clear development of the case for Jehovah it is necessary they should be treated, the former will of course constitute the subject-matter of the present chapter. To the radical discussion of it, therefore, I now turn.

When in stating the question it has been said, "*defective view of the eternal covenants*," doubtless, none more than the theologians and divines of the P. R. Baptist Churches themselves, will be astounded at the highly imperfect nature which, with respect to those covenants, I have not hesitated to ascribe to their views. On its first exhibition, unquestionably, the imputation will to their minds appear strange; nay! not merely strange, but as they apprehend, unwarranted, and in the highest degree gratuitous.

They will nevertheless I humbly trust become decreasingly astonished as we proceed: nay! will, I avouch, ere attending me to the conclusion of the chapter, find my charge by the secret voice of their own consciences ratified. For while (which I presume not to deny) it is a fact—fact upon which these divines exceedingly value themselves—that with a speciality of reference altogether singular, *they* habitually dwell upon the covenants of Jehovah; ay! in their partial or one-sided exhibitions of divine truth, accord them a prominence of notice which is peculiar to the preachers of no other sect; yet ere closing the present chapter, I despair not of the desirable, the highly expedient result, of establishing at the bar of their own consciences, the conviction above confidently predicated.

Granting then in full, the position which these theologians and divines are entitled to claim, the assertion which with regard to them I have recorded, is not thereby to be overthrown. I have said—and intend also to prove—that ultra-Calvinists of every school, and of course those with whom I specially contend, are utterly destitute of *such* knowledge of the divine covenants, as may, in a full, grand, scriptural point of view be designated, *God-justifying knowledge*. For admitting as true, that these parties have a knowledge of part, yea, a very considerable part of the things named—conceding also, that to the measure of its extent the knowledge which they possess is even to be held correct—yet the fact abides, that knowledge in mere part of any divine matter, albeit to the measure of its extent correct, neither is, nor so long as it continues to stop short of full measure may be said to be, GOD-JUSTIFYING KNOWLEDGE: or to make the idea which I am anxious to bring before the mind unmistakably clear, let me say, such knowledge, as by perfection of its nature, puts those who are the subjects of it in possession of THE WHOLE TRUTH by which JEHOVAH IS GLORIFIED. Because, knowledge which is merely in part—though to its extent correct—being nevertheless altogether defective in point of range, does, through failing to reach to such facts and circumstances as lie beyond, invariably have for its effect, to hold excluded from the mind that full-orbed, that divinely symmetrical view of truth, which results from a knowledge more complete. The utmost therefore which may be predicated of such knowledge as is in mere part of a divine matter, is, that it apprehends a measure of eternal truth, and in its partial character, does within certain limits bring into the mind that which is true with respect to God; but through utter defectiveness in range, failing to put those who are the subjects of it in possession of ALL THAT IS TRUE in Jehovah's case; or perhaps I ought rather to say, through defectiveness of range ex-

cluding from the minds of the parties concerned MUCH THAT IS TRUE in Jehovah's case; even that consummate view of the divine matter which results and can only result from a knowledge more complete, therefore, it is certainly not what I have distinguished as—GOD-JUSTIFYING KNOWLEDGE; that just knowledge, which by reason of its bringing home to the understanding of the party concerned ALL THAT IS TRUE with regard to Jehovah, is alone in the high, grand, scriptural acceptance, entitled to be designated—THE TRUTH; to wit, THE ENTIRE CASE, in which THE LORD IS EXALTED AND MAGNIFIED. To speak more plainly, more unmistakably still, be it said, that that knowledge in mere part of which I have rightly affirmed that in a high, grand, scriptural acceptance it cannot be entitled God-justifying knowledge, does, through that defectiveness in range which I am considering, inevitably land the party or parties thus partially, thus defectively perceiving, not merely in fallacious, but oftentimes disastrous and dangerous conclusions.

That the actual truth of this assertion may appear, I cite as an instrument of proof, the very decisive, the highly illustrative case, of the partially enlightened theologians with whom I contend. It would certainly be very far from true to say, that they have no perception of the eternal covenants; for everybody in a position to judge, that is, every scripturally and rightly informed party, knows of a very certainty that they have. Nay! more: that to the bound to which such perception extends, it is scriptural, correct, just. Here then is knowledge in part: and knowledge even in part, is, in a very note-worthy sense—LIGHT. But even concerning light—ay! true or divine light—it is by the finger of God plainly written,—“*If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness.*” (Matt. vi. 23.) Glance now for a moment at the monstrous—the altogether hideous conclusions—in which mere partial perception has landed these ultra-Calvinistic theologians, and you cannot for a moment fail to be convinced, that as far as the covenants of Jehovah are concerned, that merely partial perception which in them, which in a highly note-worthy sense also is *light*, has nevertheless by reason of its extremely defective range, become in some respects an instrument or minister of darkness. For is it not a fact—fact which none more loudly than these theologians themselves do incessantly proclaim—that through this merely partial perception of the eternal covenants which is peculiar to them, they are plunged headlong into the following, I say not simply absurd, but disastrous and even treasonable conclusions?—conclusions with which, for their effectual refutation, it will be my high province in this chapter to deal? First, that the free act of Jehovah, in vouchsafing as a

sovereign gift through the cross the Holy Spirit and His grace to the elect, must infallibly have for its effect, to annihilate the high prerogative of Jehovah to require that which is indispensable of the non-elect. And secondly, that the divine right thus to act equitably toward the non-elect, having through His vouchsafement of free grace to the elect been annihilated, therefore, when in setting a proffer of life before the former Jehovah sees fit to call to repentance and faith, this evangelical act on His part is necessarily altogether unjust. And thirdly, that in His act of thus setting a proffer of life before the non-elect and calling to repentance and faith, the Lord Jehovah, Himself the Eternal Well-spring of equity, having rendered the Divine Majesty unjust, therefore, that partial or one-sided ministry of the Word which resists Him—which by resisting practically rectifies His unrighteousness—and by thus rectifying absolutely rebukes—even that ministry, and that alone is true; every other which would obey, erroneous; hence to be condemned, publicly denounced as false, and branded as Arminian. Such the opinions of the ultra-Calvinistic theologians with whom I contend; as by themselves, more than all others, with the tongue of a trumpet proclaimed. Here then, as I said, is practically but very lamentably demonstrated the truth of the entire proposition which I have advanced: to wit, that that knowledge of a divine matter which is merely in part, is not GOD-JUSTIFYING KNOWLEDGE; such knowledge as extends to the whole case by which THE DEITY IS EXALTED AND GLORIFIED; such knowledge as puts in possession of—THE TRUTH. By the actual results therefore in the melancholy case before us, let the reader bear record, that I have abundant reason for the exposition which forms the subject-matter of the present chapter: for here, alas! (themselves being the judges) are theologians and divines, through defectiveness of range in their knowledge, plunged headlong into conclusions from which, instinctively, and with abhorrence, every sanctified spirit must of necessity recoil.

Turn now for a single instant to the worldly view of the case. If all which has been advanced with respect to knowledge in mere part be true—might in full force be applied to the most ordinary and unimportant affairs of life—then, even in this much lower, this purely earthly sense, and with respect to sublunary, secular, and perishing things, might it not with deep emphasis be said,—*How unspeakable, of a truth, the importance of possessing consummate knowledge!* But where the things concerned are divine—nothing less than the wisdom, will, and sovereign right of God—His divinely momentous purpose in the non-elect—even the glorification in the very highest of His exalted nature and name; and where these transcendently august things, do by inevitable ne-

cessity involve the mighty matters of filial obligation, Christian integrity, and ministerial duty—duty to the righteous discharge of which the ray of such light as shall not prove instrumental unto darkness is absolutely, indispensably requisite; then, under this incomparably nobler, this infinitely more dignified and exalted class of considerations, might it not reasonably and most emphatically be exclaimed,—*How incalculably, how unutterably important, is personal possession of a consummate knowledge!*

It is just possible, or at least I may venture to say barely conceivable, that even by those, or a few of them with whom I contend, this may at length in all candour be granted. And if it should, then, turning yet again, but more closely, more heedfully still, to the deep solemnity, the momentousness of the considerations involved,—in lively anticipation moreover of that sure judgment which now for a long season lingereth not, and the award of which tarrieth not,—do I, by the blood of redemption in the efficacy of which such parties have professed to believe; by the majesty of the Incarnate Deity shedding it whose name and sceptre they have professed to revere; and by the nature and character of the Eternal Father to exalt which they have professed to believe Christ died; do I, I say,—here—publicly—in the presence of God and man—instantly cite them to the duty of giving all heed to obtain for themselves a more enlarged, a more consummate knowledge of the eternal covenants; covenants upon the due execution of which is suspended, to an extent by man utterly un conjectured and inconceivable, the vindication of the moral excellency of Jehovah.

EXPOSITION IN FULL OF THE COVENANTS.

Having premised thus much (if peradventure the Lord shall see fit to sanctify it) with design to stir up in respect of the mighty theme at issue, both ingenuousness and an irrepressible spirit of inquiry, without unnecessarily elaborating preliminary remark I forthwith submit the question, *What in clear form is signified, when it is said, a divine covenant?*

This first, highly pertinent inquiry, involves two distinct and widely differing ideas, consequently necessitates two clear and intelligent replies. The first, with reference to the question in its high, its celestial signification; the second, in its lower, to wit, its earthly and more ordinary. On both, for the sake of precision, it is necessary to lay down a brief word of explanation.

First then, a divine covenant in the high, the celestial signification,—that is, considered with exclusive reference to the *Deity*, in immediate connexion with the person of Jehovah,—is neither more nor less than that contemporaneous conceiving,

choosing, and—in the moral beauty of an ineffable, unimaginable mutual love—consenting together, ratifying, and determining, of the three distinct personal understandings, but ONE ESSENTIAL MIND, of the ever-blessed, ever-adorable Trinity; by virtue of which, the things thus divinely approved, are immovably fixed, or predestined to stand. Or to state in greater detail the sublime fact, it is in the above clause expressly meant, that whatever by the infinite understanding of the Eternal Father is wisely conceived, sovereignly chosen, and—because at the same time by the infinite understanding of the Eternal Word, the infinite understanding also of the Eternal Spirit, equally wisely conceived, and sovereignly chosen—therefore, in the ineffable love and perfect unity which by nature the Eternal Former has with the two Eternal Latter, in intense mutuality with These consented to, ratified, determined—and vice versa—insomuch that by virtue of this infinitely wise conceiving, choosing, and in mutual love determining, the thing thus conceived, chosen, and through mutual love determined, is for ever fixed, established, and caused to stand, *that*, in the high, the purely unearthly, or as I have called it, celestial sense, is I say a divine covenant. For the several conceptions, elections, and determinations to which reference is here made, being conceptions, elections, and determinations under seal of a wisdom infinitely, inconceivably exalted,—hence incapable by any modification of increased perfection,—are of necessity, or by augustness of nature, immutable; that is, are from before the birth, if I may so speak, as with lead in the rock written down ineffaceably and for ever. Here then is the writing which is without hand: writing not by etymological sign, cipher, or hieroglyphic, but the mutual, adamantine LET BE, of the Three Eternal Persons constituting the sole Godhead.

So much then for a divine covenant, as considered with immediate reference to the Deity. But this, it is clear, is not the earthly, the more ordinary sense. Leaving therefore the high, the celestial acceptance of the term, and coming down to what might be called the biblical or ordinary, What, I again submit, is meant by a divine covenant? To this once more very plainly I answer, Such a divinely inspired record or writing, as by authority of the several distinct Persons of the Godhead, sets forth those infinitely wise conceptions, and elections, of the distinct personal understandings of the Eternal Three, which by virtue of the ineffable love and perfect unity of These between Themselves, have with Each Other been determined—hence, fixed and unchangeably established. In this case, it will very clearly be seen, that the record or writing is not like in the former instance, that is, a something standing exclusively in the high conception, choice,

and determination of Mind Divine ; but, is actual—with ink—and in the symbol and character of earth. It is plain, therefore, that a divine covenant in this biblical and ordinary acceptation, is a something the design of which has exclusive reference to man—not God.

For a short moment at the outset of this enquiry I have dwelt upon these facts, because in the very clearest they serve to shew, that when the substance of that which in the written covenants of Jehovah has been revealed, is so holy, so unutterably sublime, it ill becomes mortals of earth in any part thereof to overlook, lightly esteem, or deny the divine glory. But this, exactly, is what I affirm is done, when men grasp with all tenacity one part of the revealed substance of the divine covenant, and in determined prejudice, bias of mind, heart-hostility, refuse either to enquire into or regard the other. Act, which to all intents and purposes is, on the one hand to manifest the obstinacy “of the horse or mule which have no understanding ;” on the other that Christ-reprobated spirit which “loves darkness rather than light because the deeds are evil.”

Having then, first, in its exalted or purely celestial sense, and secondly, in an acceptation more ordinary, set forth the nature of a divine covenant ; the imperative duty moreover of the creature, to incline the ear and hear the whole counsel of God as therein made manifest ; the next step in order to a clear development of the question at issue is, to lay down what is expressly meant when I have said—“THE ETERNAL COVENANTS.”

In the expression, “eternal covenants,” as here adopted, there is no reference whatever to that original covenant, called in theological treatises “Covenant of Works ;” under which, on his creation, Adam was immediately placed. The reason why the term “covenants” as in this enquiry used, is not to be considered as having any reference to the covenant of Adam, is, that the argument may be kept as simple and unencumbered as possible. And since the “Covenant of Works” does not at any point come into the present controversy—since moreover I make no charge against my doctrinal antagonists for ignorance with respect to it—it is for clearness sake well that I make known, that that Covenant is altogether excluded. What things by the expression “divine covenants” I *do* expressly mean, are *evangelical covenants*, the covenants of Christ Jesus alone. When therefore speaking in a purely evangelical sense I have adopted the term covenant in its plural form, saying, the “divine covenants,” those instruments which I have thus designated covenants are in number two ; but taken together, constitute one Grand Eternal Covenant, called otherwise, “The New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ.”

In reality, therefore, there is between the august Persons of the Godhead but one evangelical Covenant ; even that Great Writing of which Christ himself has emphatically said, that it is ratified by His own blood ; which blood, on that very ground, He expressly calls, HIS BLOOD OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. But forasmuch as that One Covenant consists of two distinct and widely differing parts, it is for the sake of theological accuracy highly expedient, that with extraordinary care I distinguish between them, by entitling (but always in a highly subordinate sense) each a separate Covenant. This then, let the reader understand is my meaning, when in approaching this great subject I have spoken in the plural form, saying, the Lord's "DIVINE COVENANTS."

In this plural form of the term covenant which I have adopted, my express meaning having now been shewn to be evangelical—the covenants spoken of exclusively those of the Lord Jesus Christ—covenants which taken together constitute that Grand Eternal Covenant called the New Testament—the next question for consideration in this enquiry is, be it observed, one of the utmost moment. To every earnest inquirer, therefore, whose soul is bent on the truth and the whole truth of God, I would say, in the question and reply which are now to be submitted, may it be yours, to take the one and the other upon the tablets of your soul, with such impress as shall infallibly prove indelible. That important question, to the radical, the final settlement of which I thus cite my reader, is this, viz., *With what deep and momentous design*, has that Grand Eternal Covenant which I have affirmed to consist of two distinct parts or subordinate covenants, to wit, the New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ, BEEN BETWEEN THE FATHER AND THE SON ESTABLISHED ?

Now the entire answer to this deeply important question, as by ultra-Calvinistic divines heretofore always furnished, is this, 'That the design of Jehovah in the said Covenant was, to bring in a righteous atonement for the sin of the elect ; by the blood of Christ redeem them from legal forfeiture ; and in Him provide for them all gifts of grace necessary in time, all blessings of glory expedient in eternity. With regard to this answer, as far as it extends, it is quite true : but it does not—no ! not by a mighty hand—exhaust the case. You therefore ask these theologians, What else ? They are either stone dumb, or else they reply, 'Nothing more : the case is concluded.' Here then is the defective knowledge of these parties brought into open manifestation. Might it not well in genuine Shaksperian stanza be responded ?—

There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio,
Than are dreamt of by *your* philosophy.

But in contradistinction to the verdict, and for the enlightenment of the judgment of all such ultra-Calvinistic divines, I here, (taking stand on Jehovah's infallible word), do most firmly, most uncompromisingly affirm, that so far from the opinion under consideration being correct, the wisdom of the Spirit of God makes determinedly against it; shewing, with a speciality of intent which may not possibly be evaded, as follows. To wit, that the Grand Eternal Covenant of Jehovah, or New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ, stands ratified between the Father and the Son for purpose no less comprehensive than this, to wit, **THE CARRYING OUT OR PERFECTING OF ALL THINGS WHICH IN THE COUNSELS OF OLD, OF ETERNITY, HAD BY THE FATHER AND THE SON BEEN PRE-DETERMINED.** With this design, it is set up, and as far as we have knowledge could only be set up, upon one foundation. That broad, that most equitable foundation is, the **WHOLE WORK** accomplished by the incarnate Son; including His humiliation by subjection from the birth to the law, humiliation by servitude as a subject under the law, humiliation by death in accordance with the sanction of the law: as it is written,—“*This is MY BLOOD OF THE NEW TESTAMENT which is shed for many for the remission of sins.*” (Matt. xxvi. 28.) If then the unspeakably precious blood which was shed on Calvary, be indeed as Christ affirms it to be, the blood of the New Testament, that is, blood by which as under a seal the New Testament has been legally ratified, then, nothing can be clearer, nothing more self-evident than the fact, that whatever on that Testament's sacred page exists—whatever by the Spirit of God has been engraven there—whatever in the form of stipulation between the Father and the Son been there recorded—whatever for the glory of the Father and the Son there publicly attested—has been set up, exclusively, upon the broad **WORK OF CHRIST.** Nay! it is certain, that it could have been set up in no other way: for all men, elect and non-elect, having fallen under legal condemnation, they must, but for the intervention of the New Covenant in the blood of Christ, have been dealt with according to the sanction of the law; that is, consigned to a summary damnation. Let it therefore be particularly remembered, that upon the broad, the equitable ground of the Work of Christ alone—that work terminating in the shedding unto the death of His precious blood—the Eternal Covenant has, for every possible end in connexion with the divine glory, been between the Father and the Son ratified. This Work of Christ then, is not as by the generality of high Calvinists erroneously supposed, *solely* for the salvation of the elect; but for the carrying into effect of **ALL THINGS WHATEVER**, which *apart* from the legal or instantaneous damnation of the apostate

human race, have by the Father and the Son been firmly determined.

I have felt it necessary, hence have taken extraordinary pains to draw the attention of the reader to this fact, for the important reason, that the Eternal Covenant, or New Testament in the blood of Christ, has by ultra-Calvinistic theologians of every school been invariably cut in two; and the one half of that Covenant exalted and magnified, as though a mere half, did accurately and sufficiently represent the whole. Is it, I ask, under these circumstances at all astonishing, that delusions and contradictions—the very greatest—should have gone abroad, found favour, and been perpetuated? In explanation of the assertion here made, let the inquirer now be pleased to take note, That ultra-Calvinistic theologians in general, but especially those particular parties with whom I contend, fixing eye exclusively upon the grand doctrines of—election—regeneration through divine grace of the elect—the conversion, sanctification, and salvation of these, and of these alone—have at length come to the conclusion, that the purpose of God in the Work of Christ is exhausted by the case of the elect: and that in the redemption and glorification of that portion of the human race called the Church, or Bride, the purpose of God is completed. As a consequence of this conception, a term by which to designate the Eternal Covenant or New Testament, has been devised and is very generally adopted. That term—a term wholly inadequate to represent the whole Covenant—is this, “THE COVENANT OF GRACE:” the ideas in connexion with which—as from the very term itself may be guessed—extend not by jot or tittle beyond the case of the elect. Now this is, in effect, to cut the Eternal Covenant or New Testament as from the beginning that has existed between the Father and the Son, exactly in half; and set up the mere half, as though that solitary half did accurately and sufficiently represent the whole. For as I have already said, the Eternal Covenant of Christ, or in other words, The New Testament in the blood of Christ, *as set up upon the broad foundation of the whole WORK OF CHRIST—that work culminating in death*—is established not merely for the salvation of the elect, though doubtless (speaking after the fashion of men) that is the noblest and grandest part of the divine purpose therein; BUT IS FOR THE CARRYING OUT OR PERFECTING OF ALL THINGS WHICH BY THE INFINITE WISDOM OF THE FATHER AND THE SON HAVE FROM A PAST ETERNITY BEEN DETERMINED.

With regard however to the term Covenant of Grace, with which as with a sword the Eternal Covenant or New Testament has invariably been cut in half, I here crave leave to subjoin, that

not only can there be no valid objection to its use, but that as a mere term considered, it is, when with discrimination restricted to its own proper sphere, in the highest degree apposite. If then by the term, Covenant of Grace, that special, that humanly speaking loftier or more glorious portion of the Eternal Covenant—portion which immediately and exclusively testifies to the case of the elect—be intended, then that term is of admirable adaptation to represent the idea before the mind—is rightfully and lawfully employed. But if, as is invariably the case with ultra-Calvinistic theologians, it be used to signify the whole Everlasting Covenant set up between the Father and the Son, then, seeing that it only represents that particular portion of this Covenant which bears immediately and exclusively upon the elect, the term is *very grossly abused*. For it is an absolute fact, that in the Eternal Covenant or New Testament in the blood of Christ, there is between the Father and the Son a vast amount of stipulation altogether differing and distinct from *that*, which as relating to the elect alone has been set forth in the Covenant of Grace. Use then the term *Covenant of Grace* to cut off, remove, sever from the Eternal Covenant or New Testament in the blood of Christ, that awfully momentous portion foreign to the case of the elect and intimately relating to that of the non-elect,—in which, with respect to this portion of the human race, such irreversible stipulations as are for the glory of the Father and the Son have for general information been recorded,—and that moment instead of righteously using the term in question, you most unwarrantably and egregiously abuse it.

But leaving now the expression Covenant of Grace, a term I emphatically assert significant only of that special or loftier portion of the Eternal Covenant or New Testament which bears exclusively upon the elect; leaving I say that merely partial expression, and coming to the Eternal Covenant or New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ in its entirety, What do we find? I answer, This. Over and above that particular portion of it which is represented by the term Covenant of Grace, *an exceedingly weighty, nay! an unutterably solemn and awful SECOND HALF, embodying things which relate exclusively to the non-elect*: for the giving effect to which, of course on the sole possible ground of the WORK OF CHRIST, there have been between the Father and the Son passed immutable stipulations. Now shall we, I submit, call this also the Covenant of Grace? Shall we, speaking of that particular portion of the Eternal Covenant or New Testament in the blood of Christ which has no reference whatever to the elect, but the bearing of which is altogether and exclusively upon the non-elect, designate such portion by the distinctive term, Covenant of

Grace? God forbid. For this part of the Eternal Covenant or New Testament in the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ—the stipulations of which, as chosen and ratified between the Father and the Son, are altogether distinct and separate from that other part of the same Eternal Covenant in which through the special mercy of Jehovah is made boundless provision for the sanctification and salvation of the elect—is a part, which will not mingle nor coalesce with its opposite. In dealing therefore with this second part of the Eternal Covenant or New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ, in which are recorded those stipulations which relate exclusively to the non-elect, we may not, as do the mass of ultra-Calvinistic theologians who fail to apprehend this fact, blindly entitle it the Covenant of Grace. We must needs furnish it with another name; some name more in harmony with its nature; more pertinent, applicable, convenient. But be the name by which we see fit to designate it whatever it may, the fact abides, that as soon as we have named it, then, there under the title selected will this particular portion of the Eternal Covenant or New Testament in the blood of Christ stand forth, in contradistinction to that humanly speaking nobler portion of the same Great Covenant, which has been entitled Covenant of Grace. It must therefore by all unprejudiced parties be acknowledged, that in absolute defiance of the tenets and systems of men, such portion constitutes a highly momentous SECOND PART of that Eternal Covenant or New Testament, which, as ratified by the blood of the cross, exists between the Father and the Son. Now this part, exactly, it is, WHICH BY ULTRA-CALVINISTIC THEOLOGIAN OF ALL SCHOOLS HAS HITHERTO BEEN COMPLETELY OVERLOOKED.

But here by some such hyper-Calvinistic theologian, some inveterate opponent of the divine purpose in the non-elect, I shall doubtless be challenged to shew, the actual substance of that OTHER HALF of the Eternal Covenant or New Testament in the blood of Christ, to which, as a chosen witness to the whole truth, I in the name of Jehovah very sternly hold him. The challenge with all cheerfulness I accept: and, thus and thus, for general information very plainly testify.

First, by that OTHER HALF of the Eternal Covenant or New Testament in the blood of Christ, which for the sake of distinction I now take leave to designate THE COVENANT OF EQUITY, I expressly mean, that distinct part of the New Testament which stands not related to the chosen seed, but bears exclusively on souls *not chosen*: that distinct part of the New Testament which witnesses those express stipulations, which in connexion with the *non-elect* have by the Father and the Son been adopted and ra-

tified : that distinct part of the New Testament which provides the full warrant by which to give actual and practical effect to those eternal purposes of the Father and the Son, which relate exclusively to *the non-elect* : that distinct part of the New Testament which in the instrumental department of Jehovah's work, arms the agents of the Father and the Son with fearful power and authority to carry out toward *the non-elect* the divine purpose ; as it is written,—“ And whosoever shall not receive you, *nor hear your words*, when ye depart out of that house or city, shake off the dust of your feet (for a testimony as Mark adds) against them. Verily I say unto you, It shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom and Gomorrah in the day of judgment, than for that city.” (Matt. x. 14, 15.) This will, I apprehend, be sufficient to indicate what expressly I mean, by that OTHER HALF of the Eternal Covenant or New Testament in the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which by the ultra-Calvinistic theologians whom I oppose has been ignored or too blindly overlooked : even that whole part of the New Testament, *in which*, the divine purpose bearing exclusively on the non-elect is witnessed ; and *by which*, those stipulations indispensable to the full developement of that purpose, as by the Father and the Son chosen, the ratifying blood of the cross rendered irreversible, are attested and publicly recorded.

But secondly, with reference to the *actual substance* of that OTHER HALF of the Eternal Covenant or New Testament in the blood of Christ which has by ultra-Calvinistic theologians been completely disregarded, replying by anticipation to the challenge of such parties to shew what it is, I here (but without attempting accurately to classify) proceed from the page of revelation to adduce the more palpable of its component parts.

On the side of the Father, then, it has of old been expressly stipulated. First,—That the work of the Son, having by the all-comprehending wisdom of Jehovah been deemed infinitely sufficient, therefore, that work shall be decreed an absolutely equitable ground on which in connexion with the non-elect, to carry out to the uttermost the inscrutable intents of the Father. Secondly,—That the work of the Son being held to be such an all-sufficient ground, the Father shall be free to prove the absence of malice toward the fallen, by setting forth before these parties a free proffer of life, together with the gospel call to the comely act of repentance. Thirdly,—That the work of the Son being held to be such an all-sufficient ground, therefore, for the perfecting of proof as to this absence of malice toward the fallen, the Father shall be free to provide against the event of repentance, by accompanying His gospel call to that comely act, by a still further *call to faith* in Christ for the remission of sin. Fourthly,—That

the work of the Son being held to be such an all-sufficient ground, therefore, as a practical and eternal proof to the validity or bonâ-fide character of that proffer of life which is set before the non-elect in the Son, the Father shall be free, in proportion to the measure of contempt displayed by these parties toward His goodness, to impute, according to the strictest requirement of equity, *guilt*. Fifthly,—That the work of the Son being held to be such an all-sufficient ground, therefore, as a final or grand consummating proof to the reality, the bonâ-fide character of that proffer of life which is through the Son submitted to the non-elect, the Father shall be free, altogether apart from that legal condemnation which is for ordinary sin—sin through breach of the spirit and sanction of the law—evangelically to arraign, equitably and eternally condemn, for all contempt of His divine goodness as to the fallen made manifest through the gospel. And Sixthly,—That the work of the Son being held to be such an all-sufficient ground, therefore, by eternal exhibition to the Church and the elect angels, of all despisers of the gospel in a state of evangelically augmented retribution, Jehovah shall be free to renew in the hearts of His holy intelligences, the very liveliest remembrance of what WAS the greatness of His goodness toward the lost: as it is written,—“And it shall come to pass, that from one new moon to another, and from one sabbath to another, shall all flesh come to worship before me, saith the Lord. And they (the inhabitants of the new heavens and the new earth) *shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of THE MEN THAT HAVE TRANSGRESSED AGAINST ME: for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring to all flesh.*” Which fearful doom, in its special or evangelical bearing on despisers of the gospel, is by the Lord Jesus Christ himself thus expounded,—“But I say unto you, *That it shall be more tolerable for the land of Sodom in the day of judgment THAN FOR THESE.*” (See Is. lxvi. 23, 24: Matt. xi. 24.)

The above are a few of the leading stipulations, (by ultra-Calvinistic theologians of all schools absolutely overlooked), which as evidence to the divine purpose in the non-elect, have in that OTHER HALF of the Eternal Covenant or New Testament ratified by the blood of Christ, called here the Covenant of Equity, been on the part of the Everlasting Father most explicitly recorded.

But turning next to the case of the co-equal, co-essential Son, What, be it asked, in that OTHER HALF of the Eternal Covenant or New Testament which ultra-Calvinistic divines have so entirely failed to detect, are the leading stipulations with reference to the non-elect, which with design to glorify the Lord Jesus Christ, have been wisely ordained and divinely attested.

To this I reply, On the part of the Son, it has of old thus expressly been stipulated. First—That His sacrificial work being held to be an all-sufficient, hence equitable ground on which in connexion with the non-elect to carry out the several purposes of the Father ; moreover, HE, AS TO HIS HOLY HUMANITY, BEING CERTAINLY VERY GOD OF VERY GOD MANIFEST IN THE FLESH ; therefore, by commitment to His human hand until the great and fearful day, of the exclusive management of all things (control of the non-elect inclusive) which in heaven and earth relate to the accomplishment of Jehovah's purposes, He, AS TO HIS HOLY HUMANITY, be, by equal honour with the Father and the Holy Ghost, in the sight of all hell and His enemies glorified. Secondly,—That His sacrificial work being held to be such an all-sufficient, such an equitable ground ; moreover, HE, AS TO HIS HOLY HUMANITY, BEING OF A TRUTH VERY GOD OF VERY GOD MANIFEST IN THE FLESH ; therefore, when the great and fearful day has finally come, by exclusive vesting in Him of the high office of judgment—sole prerogative to weigh the motives of His non-elect enemies, sole power to adjudicate upon their contumacy and causeless hate—He, AS TO HIS HOLY HUMANITY, be by equal honour with the Father and the Holy Ghost, to the shame of His enemies transcendently magnified. Lastly,—That His sacrificial work being held to be such an all-sufficient, such an equitable ground ; moreover, HE, AS TO HIS HOLY HUMANITY, BEING OF A CERTAINTY VERY GOD OF VERY GOD MANIFEST IN THE FLESH ; therefore, when the great and fearful day has given place to another—the day of wrath and unutterable doom—by the Father putting all His enemies of the non-elect beneath His feet, and to their confusion permanently committing the keys of death and hell to His hand—anointing also publicly and to the uttermost the sceptre of His dominion over them, He, AS TO HIS HOLY HUMANITY, be, by equal honour with the Father and the Holy Ghost, as Divine Victor everlastingly exalted.

Thus much for the Eternal Covenant or New Testament in the blood of Christ, as that bears upon the non-elect : to wit, the actual substance of that OTHER HALF of the grand Covenant of Salvation which ultra-Calvinistic theologians have so utterly failed to detect. To that OTHER HALF, I have for the sake of theological precision applied the term Covenant of Equity : and the reason why I have thus named it is, because by its proceeding exclusively on equitable principles, it stands forth to view in striking contrast with the Covenant of Grace. The above are its leading, its more prominent stipulations, as by the Father and the Son adopted and ratified : and because fixed and immutable, *therefore*, by the inspiring Spirit, on the face of that special in-

strument the Eternal Covenant or New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ, unmistakably recorded. All this, however, those who take upon themselves to deny the evangelical purpose of Jehovah in the non-elect, and on the strength of that error glory in their antagonism to apostolic practice, assume right on the warrant of *human reason* to reject. For with the utmost assurance (but not from the Scriptures) they give us to understand, *that in no sense whatever has the sacrifice of Christ to do with the non-elect.* Were this gratuitous allegation true, then, since the non-elect are sinners condemned by law, it is in a legal and equitable point of view evident, that whether for the clearing of the Godhead from suspicion of malice, or for any other purpose, *Christ has no true proffer of life to set before them.* As a consequence, there can be no possibility be on the part of the non-elect guilt, for the *rejection of such a proffer*; and again, no possibility in the absence of guilt, for a shadow of gospel *condemnation.* All which being granted, the admission is tantamount to a positive assertion, that there can be no such thing as room for a Covenant of Equity. It follows, as a matter of course, that there being absolutely no room for a Covenant of Equity, it is morally impossible that there should be such a Covenant. But the shadows of ruin gather thick and fast around the rationalistic theory of these theologians: for now that on the sole warrant of *human reason* the existence of a Covenant of Equity in the blood of Christ is denied, on what other ground will they in an equitable God justify the several acts, of calling non-elect and fallen souls, souls already under the sanction of His own holy law most justly condemned, TO REPENT AND TURN TO GOD? calling also TO BELIEVE FOR THE REMISSION OF SIN ON CHRIST? nay! adjudging them to EXTRA CONDEMNATION for *not* thus by repentance turning, *not* thus for the remission of sins believing on Christ? Has the incorruptible, the immaculate Lawgiver grown so regardless of his own truth, justice, government, as Himself recklessly to contravene the law? Let those then, who upon no other warrant than the deductions of *natural reason*, deny the existence of that Covenant of Equity in the blood of Christ which I exalt, shew—if they can—if they dare venture—on what other equitable ground Jehovah, that Holiest of holies, is able, to the eternal glorifying of His great, His most venerable name, to do the things specified. For the eliciting of truth, therefore, I HERE PUBLICLY AND VERY EARNESTLY INVITE THEM TO THE TASK.

Having in defence of the divine purpose, rescued from unmerited oblivion THAT OTHER HALF of the Eternal Covenant or New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ which ultra-Calvinistic divines so persistently consign to burial, I proceed to

place in juxtaposition therewith, that which alone these divines seem to have eyes to behold, viz., the Covenant of Grace.

By the term Covenant of Grace, I expressly mean, THAT HALF of the Eternal Covenant or New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ, which bears exclusively upon the chosen seed,—the heirs through redemption, or absolute purchase of the blood of Christ, to eternal life. This, humanly speaking, more GLORIOUS HALF of the Eternal Covenant or New Testament, which alone is entitled to be designated by the term Covenant of Grace, proceeds, as a matter of course, upon the very same ground as that OTHER HALF in which is recorded the divine purpose with regard to the non-elect, to wit, GOD'S SUPREME AND UNCHALLENGABLE RIGHT. It exhibits, however, a much more extraordinary stretch of the divine prerogative, than is evidenced by that half which bears upon the non-elect. If the latter stand in right sovereign and supreme, the former, unquestionably, in a sovereign and supreme right more transcendent. The consequence is, that the sovereign and supreme right of Jehovah as illustrated in the case of the elect, so far from disproving (as by the opponents of apostolic practice supposed) the sovereign and supreme right of Jehovah in connection with the non-elect, does only (to their confusion) serve the more abundantly to demonstrate it.

The Covenant of Grace then, which proceeds exclusively upon the supreme and unchallengeable right of Jehovah, like that other evangelical covenant, the Covenant of Equity, is necessarily set up upon the grand WORK OF CHRIST,—but with this noteworthy difference. That whereas in the infinite wisdom of God, the former, or Covenant of Equity, *does not* between the Son of God and non-elect establish immutable, everlasting relations of peace; yet between the Church and Saviour, the latter, or Covenant of Grace, most assuredly DOES. On the broad basis of that infinite honour which through the sacrifice of Himself has by Christ been restored to the law, and by virtue of that sovereign unchallengeable right which inalienably pertains to the Deity, the following eternal, immutable relations, have, as recorded in the Covenant of Grace, been by the preconcerting wisdom of the Father, between the Son and the Church-elect established.

First,—That the law-magnifying Work of Christ, having for the everlasting, the honourable deliverance of the predestinated seed, been by the Supreme Ruler expressly accepted, therefore, the Son be held, by His blood actually, absolutely, and eternally—to have redeemed—recovered by purchase—bought back body and soul from the power of death, the grave, and hell—every legally forfeit member of the Church-elect.

Secondly,—That the law-magnifying Work of Christ, having

for the purpose already stated been by the Supreme Ruler expressly accepted, therefore, the Son of God in the character of Saviour, Husband, Sanctifier, and King, be elected Head over the redeemed Church for ever.

Thirdly,—That the law-magnifying Work of Christ, having for the purpose already stated been by the Supreme Ruler expressly accepted, therefore, the Son of God have unparticipated right to dispense to the redeemed Church the renewing grace of the Holy Spirit : thus distinguishing her, not merely above her fellows of the non-elect, but the whole band of the celestial intelligences in light.

Fourthly,—That the law-magnifying Work of Christ, having for the purpose already stated been by the Supreme Ruler expressly accepted, therefore, that the Son of God do make full exercise of His unparticipated right, by actually sending into the heart of every member of His elect Church, the secret omnipotence of the Holy Spirit ; thus quickening those hard hearts, *primarily*, unto repentance toward God, and *ultimately*, to faith in Himself : to the end, that through faith in His righteousness and blood, He may absolutely and actually seal to them in soul-experience, the grand blessings of justification and peace.

Fifthly,—That the law-magnifying Work of Christ, having for the purpose already stated been by the Supreme Ruler expressly accepted, therefore, in that new state of the Church, state of justification and adoption set forth in the foregoing proposition, the Son of God for the express purpose of Her consecration to Himself, do through the Spirit inhabit Her : renewing by the life of God her affections, and through sanctification—the sole result of His own power—setting Her apart from the service of the world, the flesh, and the devil.

Sixthly,—That the law-magnifying Work of Christ, having for the purpose already stated been by the Supreme Ruler expressly accepted, therefore, the Son of God when the great and fearful day is fully come, do openly, in presence of the assembled universe make manifest, that the Church, the Bride, being through a spiritually begotten faith, in *life-union* with Himself, She alone, by virtue of His righteousness and blood, is absolutely justified ; She alone, through the indwelling of his Holy Spirit, in her heart and affections renewed and sanctified ; She alone, through actual possession in Him of these things, (*things which together make up or constitute the earthly substance of salvation*), with Himself at the right hand of God everlastingly exalted and glorified.

Seventhly,—That the law-magnifying Work of Christ, having for the purpose already stated been by the Supreme Ruler expressly accepted, therefore, the above public proof being consum-

mated—the spirituality and consecration of the Bride through life-union with Himself demonstrated—the Son of God do, under universal acclaim of the innumerable armies of Heaven, finally crown Her as His mystical Bride ; that on His own throne, and in a state of the nearest, most perfect affinity, she may with Himself, triumphantly and everlastingly reign.

So much for the Grand Eternal Covenant, as that bears upon the elect : to wit, THAT HALF of the New Testament in the blood of Christ with which, to the utter neglect of its OTHER HALF, our ultra-Calvinistic theologians have been exclusively occupied. As altogether distinct from the Covenant of Equity, it is rightly for the sake of theological accuracy designated the Covenant of Grace : and the above, as for edification of the Church by the Spirit of God recorded, are its leading stipulations.

I have now made unmistakably manifest, the two distinct parts of Jehovah's ONE GRAND COVENANT OF SALVATION, EVEN THE NEW TESTAMENT RATIFIED IN THE PRECIOUS BLOOD OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. There, to the perpetual confusion of all who would unjustly diminish in divine truth, stand those distinct parts : the Covenant of Equity on the one hand, and the Covenant of Grace on the other. The former, if never before so understood, will now at least be seen to bear exclusively upon the *non-elect* ; the latter, as exclusively upon the *elect*. The former, sets as a root of life the Lord Jesus Christ before the non-elect, and as a matter of pure equity calls to repentance and faith ; the latter, sets as a root of life the Lord Jesus Christ before the elect, and while righteously calling to repentance and faith, is, that the call may be effectual, backed by the quickening grace of the Holy Spirit. The former, has place through a free exercise by Jehovah of His sovereign right to deal equitably ; the latter, through a free exercise under the blood of Christ of His sovereign right to deal graciously. The former, for a sinful disregard by the non-elect of the good-will therein expressed, brings upon those parties righteous condemnation ; the latter, under vouchsafement of the Holy Spirit's grace, by effectually overthrowing in the elect their sinful disregard, brings upon those parties, justification. It ought now therefore to be very clearly seen, that this former and this latter, as much in substance as in principle, are diverse ; being, the one from the other, perpetually or for ever distinct. The Covenant of Equity, deals with the non-elect altogether and exclusively on the principle of natural rectitude. That is, because in setting forth a free proffer of life it is necessary, that the party actually receiving the divine gift should be brought off from the pursuit and practice of sin, therefore, as an equitable condition in order to the grant of that gift, the Supreme

Ruler sees fit in this Covenant to demand of the wrong-doer repentance toward God, and for remission of the just punishment of sin, entire dependance of soul upon Christ by faith. These, in a purely ethical point of view, are the comely, the befitting conditions of things ; and upon these, exclusively, Jehovah proceeds with the non-elect. This, is what I have described as strictly dealing with the guilty on the principle of natural rectitude. But in the Covenant of Grace, because of a divinely foreseen failure on the part of the elect in both the above conditions inseparable from the principle of natural rectitude, He vouchsafes to deal with these parties (but not without a strict regard to every feature of equity) on a principle altogether and incalculably higher, to wit, **THE ARBITRARY RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD.** That is, when that which according to the natural rectitude of the case is comely and due, had been foreseen as not by the elect creature yielded, then, Jehovah, through that most righteous of channels, the sacrifice of His co-essential Son, determined the free bestowment on those parties of the grace of the Holy Spirit ; by which, in them, to effect that very repentance and faith, which in infinite wisdom He deemed it just to require, and by supremacy had the right to command.

With a view to disabuse of error the minds of those who deny the evangelical purpose of Jehovah in the non-elect, a concise exhibition of those distinct Covenants, which together constitute the One Eternal Covenant of our Lord Jesus Christ, has now been set forth. To complete the present argument, therefore, all that remains to be done is, that I should for a few moments advert on that stupendous blunder, to which in the earlier pages of this chapter I have so pointedly, so particularly referred : the blunder of supposing, that the sovereign exercise by the Supreme Ruler of **A RIGHT IN GRACE** under His Covenant of Grace, must necessarily annihilate the sovereign exercise by the Supreme Ruler of **A RIGHT IN EQUITY** under His Covenant of Equity : that the sovereign exercise by the Supreme Ruler of **A RIGHT THROUGH THE BLOOD OF THE CROSS** to vouchsafe holy help to the elect, must of necessity destroy the sovereign exercise by the Supreme Ruler of **A RIGHT THROUGH THE BLOOD OF THE CROSS** to command that which is just to the non-elect : that the sovereign exercise by the Supreme Ruler of **A RIGHT THROUGH HIS OWN RIGHTEOUSNESS** to grant the elect that which no created being can claim or have ground to expect, to wit, the grace of the Spirit of God, must absolutely exclude the sovereign exercise by the Supreme Ruler of **A RIGHT THROUGH HIS OWN RIGHTEOUSNESS** to set a free proffer of life before the non-elect, and equitably call to *repentance and faith.*

If that which in the immediately preceding chapter has been laid down be conceded, to wit, that mere contingencies, passing accidents, are of no value whatever to annul original principles; hence the accident of the fall *not* of virtue to extinguish the divine right; the corrupting of itself by the creature of no force to debar from imperative obligation the Creator; then, the case being so, let the inquirer be pleased to observe, that since the elect as much as the non-elect are mere creatures, and since the former as much as the latter are creatures through sin fallen into an unsound moral condition, therefore, in the light of simple equity considered the case of both is precisely similar. That is, if in the case of the non-elect, their fall into sin and an unsound moral state, is not of virtue to divest Jehovah of right to demand of them that which is just; so likewise, in the case of the *elect themselves*, is not their fall into sin and an unsound moral state of any value to disinherit God,—that He should not have power to require of them that which is due. It follows, that if as far as the non-elect are concerned, the equitable right of Jehovah remains inalienable; so likewise as far as the elect are concerned, that sovereign right abides equally inalienable. If therefore by virtue of this equitable right it be competent to Jehovah, to set Christ as a root of life before the non-elect, and call non-elect wrong doers to the comely act of repentance; so likewise by virtue of the same equitable right is it equally competent to Jehovah, in setting Christ as a root of life before the very elect, to call these elect wrong doers to repentance. Moreover, if by virtue of His equitable right it be to Jehovah competent, to provide against the event of repentance, by issuing a still further warrant to the non-elect in the event of their repentance to believe for the remission of sin on Christ; so likewise by virtue of the same equitable right is it equally competent to Jehovah, to provide for the event of repentance, by issuing to the elect themselves a still further warrant, in the event of their repentance to believe for remission of sin on Christ. As far therefore as the **EQUITABLE RIGHT** of God over His creatures is concerned, it is manifestly in every respect as inalienable in the case of the very elect, as in that of the non-elect: and talented indeed will be that ultra-Calvinistic theologian who shall be able to disprove it.

Having then clearly set forth, that the equitable right of Jehovah to require of the fallen creature repentance and faith, extends as indisputably to the elect as the non-elect, I next summon attention to the fact, **THAT THE LORD HAS ACTUALLY DONE THIS**. But, *forasmuch as* by the omniscient God it could not from eternity fail to be foreseen, with what neglect, scorn, and derision this

equitable call to repentance and faith would on its being preached be by both elect and non-elect received,—forasmuch also as this contempt being foreknown, the fact was to Jehovah clear, that in the hearts of the elect such neglect and scorn required to be subdued,—therefore, in the deep counsels of eternity have we through the infinite wisdom of the Deity the well-ordered, the sure stipulations of the “Covenant of Grace:” a covenant replete with divine mercies of the very highest order,—mercies altogether sublime, transcendent, and as to their ultimate issues unconjecturable. Of the stipulations of this Covenant, the fourth under that arrangement which for the sake of clearness I have chosen, shews the manner in which the elect come to possess the moral graces of repentance and faith; to wit, through their anointing by God with the quickening breath of the Holy Spirit. By the coming and immediate operation of which Holy One upon their hearts, those hearts are rendered spiritually wise, feeling, contrite: and by a still further operation of His grace for their deliverance, are ultimately made to believe on Christ unto justification.

Now granting this exposition of the mighty theme to be correct, then, here before the mind have we two distinct things: first, the equitable, the unchallengable right of Jehovah, through the WORK OF CHRIST to require of his wrong doing creatures of the non-elect—every soul that has sinned against Him—that which is comely and just; to wit, *personal repentance* for sin, and *sincere faith* for its remission in Christ: and secondly, the equitable, the unchallengable right of Jehovah, through the same WORK OF CHRIST to bestow on His wrong doing, impenitent creatures of the elect, grace of the Holy Spirit unto *supernatural repentance*, and grace of the same Spirit unto *soul-justifying faith* in Christ. In the face of these two distinct rights, then, I have now to those who take upon them to deny the evangelical purpose of God in the non-elect a couple of questions to propose. First,—Can the latter of these two rights, viz., the equitable right of Jehovah through the righteousness of Christ to extend unmerited grace of the Holy Spirit to a remnant of His wrong doing creatures, avail to annul the former, viz., the equitable right of Jehovah to demand that which is comely and due of the mass? It is by every reflecting party answered, ‘Nay.’ Then notwithstanding the fact, that right in Jehovah to grant grace of the Spirit to His elect, exists, yet equal right in Him to require at the hand of the non-elect that which is comely and just, necessarily co-exists. For if as a general proposition it be granted, that right in a person to impart to one that which is not due, cannot cancel equal right in the same party to demand of another that which is, then, since the equitable right of Jehovah through

the righteousness of Christ to impart to the elect the grace of the Holy Spirit which is *not* due, cannot cancel the equitable right of that Holy One to require at the hand of the non-elect that repentance for sin which *is* due, it follows, that such divine right toward the non-elect remains. So much for my first question. Hear now my second : it is this. If as but now shewn, the right of Jehovah through Christ to bestow upon the elect his Spirit which is *not* due, cannot cancel the supreme right of that Holy One to demand of the non-elect that repentance which *is* ; then, is it at all just, wise, scriptural on the part of those who deny Jehovah's evangelical purpose in the non-elect, because they clearly discern His equitable right through Christ to bestow upon the elect the Holy Spirit which is *not* due, and by this means bring to pass SUPERNATURAL REPENTANCE,—but are too indifferent or too prejudiced to enquire after and ascertain the equitable right of Jehovah to require of the non-elect that which in equity *is* due, to wit, a befitting PERSONAL REPENTANCE,—that they should labour heart and soul to cast discredit on the latter of these two sovereign rights ; nay ! dare dogmatically and imperiously to deny ? So much for my second question. Let *those* who contend against the evangelical purpose of God toward the non-elect—ANSWER !

But enough on the twofold bearing of the Eternal Covenant has now been advanced, to establish the holy character of that position which has by Jehovah been for himself chosen, to wit, of calling His wrong doing creatures wherever the life-giving name of the Lord Jesus Christ is breathed, to repentance toward God, and faith in His crucified Son. Through the prevalency of a universal, unbounded, heart consciousness of this fact, I do not feel it necessary by elaborating argument to tax the patience of the reader further : I shall, therefore, briefly sum up and conclude.

Mark then, that on the strength of the WORK OF CHRIST—Work which in all its sublime bearings no mind save that of the infinite Deity can estimate or adequately comprehend—there *has* by the divine wisdom been *chosen*, and *is* through the precious blood of the sacrifice *ratified*, a covenant which bears exclusively upon the non-elect—the Covenant of Equity. Its purpose, as has been shewn, is, by a free proffer of life in Christ to clear the nature of God from all shadow of suspicion, and practically demonstrate that not divine election, but causeless hate of the Father and the Son—hate involving a voluntary rejection of the mercy by These freely tendered, is the immediate or proximate cause of the ruin of despisers of the gospel. For the giving of practical effect to that Covenant, *it is necessarily replete with exhortations, invitations, calls, and conditional promises*—all of which *are* addressed, particularly, to the non-elect. On the other hand,

let the reader be pleased to mark, that on the strength of the very same WORK OF CHRIST, there has in the divine wisdom been chosen, and in the precious blood of the sacrifice ratified a covenant which bears exclusively upon the elect—the Covenant of Grace. Its object, as has been shewn, is, through a divine quickening by the Spirit of the elect unto repentance, faith, and sanctification, to exalt and magnify the transcendent beneficence of God in salvation; and in the clearest manner demonstrate, that not the absence of hate in these elect but the triumph of the divine love over hate, is the cause of their everlasting, their triumphant glorification. For the giving of practical effect to this Covenant also, *it is necessarily replete with exhortations, invitations, calls, and conditional promises*: but secretly backing these, that they may be rendered effectual, is the omnipotent grace of the Holy Ghost. Whether then the Covenant of Equity be considered, or whether the Covenant of Grace, it is evident, that the requirement of repentance and faith on the part of the fallen and morally corrupt creature is the same. For in setting through the WORK OF CHRIST a free proffer of life before souls, breakers of the law, and by sanction of the law condemned, *this requirement being for the discountenancing of sin clearly apprehended by the Divine Mind as a something absolutely imperative*, THE LORD IN EITHER CASE, AND AS MUCH THAT OF THE ELECT AS THE NON-ELECT, HAS SEEN FIT TO REFUSE TO DISPENSE WITH IT. The noble fact therefore, that that repentance and faith which by necessity or intrinsic equity of the case are at the hand of the elect due—which by virtue of his supremacy Jehovah is in a position to demand—which by the gospel call He does demand—which are not by these elect souls voluntarily yielded—but which by prevalent grace of the Spirit He himself sees fit to bestow upon them—are in the very purest sense by free *gift*, that fact, I say, so far from being of virtue to divest the Lord of his right to require repentance and faith of the non-elect, does only the more incontrovertibly establish it. For it is doubtless on the part of God a much more arbitrary exercise of sovereign right, a much more absolute and impressive display of kingly prerogative, when by force of the divine omniscience it had in a past eternity been foreseen, that the general summons to repentance and faith which had been determined on would by both elect and non-elect be equally disregarded, that on the strength of His position as Supreme Ruler, He should still further in love to the elect determine the special mercies of the Covenant of Grace; even the grant of the all-conquering Spirit, and through His victorious grace the gifts of repentance, of faith, and of sanctification. If in that first and more ordinary display of prerogative, to wit, of setting before the fallen of both classes, elect and

non-elect, a proffer of life together with His gospel call or summons to repentance, the act of Jehovah was sovereign and supreme; surely in that second and more impressive, viz., His decreeing in quenchless love to contemptuous despisers of His gospel call the victorious grace of the omnipotent Spirit, the act may well be said to be **TRANSCENDENTLY SOVEREIGN, AND SUBLIMELY SUPREME.**

In conclusion, therefore, be it most emphatically said, that the great error of those rationalizing parties who oppose the divine purpose in the non-elect, to wit, of supposing that the free vouchsafement of sovereign grace to the elect must necessarily annihilate all ground for the progress of Jehovah's equitable purpose in the non-elect, is now not merely thoroughly exploded, but the plea in its defence most relied on—hitherto most vainly boasted—most magisterially urged—is seen to be that which more than all else conspires to overthrow it. For if it be conceded, that the sovereign, the most equitable right of Jehovah amply extended to the greater of these two cases, and was unchallengable, it must of necessity be admitted that the same sovereign right also extended to the less, and was in that lower sphere equally unchallengeable. That is, if over and above the issuing to the elect of the gospel call to repentance and faith, the sovereign right of Jehovah still retained sufficient virtue to decree on behalf of the despisers of that call quickening grace of the Holy Spirit, by which to compel in these non-repenting non-believing souls supernatural repentance and faith; if, I say, this sovereign right of the Deity did in the case of his fallen creatures of the elect retain virtue to extend to lengths thus extraordinary and astounding; surely the very same sovereign right must be admitted to have had virtue, to guarantee its Divine Possessor in determining to carry out a simple obligation in which He stood bound to Himself—the placing of His exalted moral nature beyond the possibility of doubt or surmise—by the noble act of setting through the **WORK OF CHRIST** a free proffer of life before the non-elect, and calling these wrong doers to repentance.

But, that this God-justifying fact, to wit, that the divine prerogative which so superabundantly extends to the greater of these cases, does by the same rule to the full as triumphantly extend to the less, might for ever be placed beyond the possibility of question or dispute, the Lord Jehovah, to the stopping of all mouths, the confusion of His wiliest antagonists, has Himself seen fit, with His own imperial finger to point to His own sovereign act—act of constraining through the instrumentality of preaching His implacable enemies to hear His gospel voice—and with solemnity of soul deep, as the enunciation of His holy

lip is true, avouch, "THAT MANY, AY ! MANY ARE CALLED, BUT FEW ARE CHOSEN."

CHAPTER V.

THAT ALL-SUFFICIENCY IN THE GRAND WORK OF CHRIST WHICH CONSTITUTES IT A RIGHTEOUS GROUND ON WHICH TO CARRY OUT THE WHOLE COUNSEL OF GOD IN THE MINISTRY, TRIUMPHANTLY DEMONSTRATED : AND THE POSITION ASSUMED BY JEHOVAH, AS MOST UNCOMPROMISINGLY LAID DOWN IN THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, HENCEFORTH AND FOR EVER RENDERED IMPREGNABLE.

THE last thing which in order to perfect the evidence for the case of Jehovah it falls to my care to establish, is, the glory of Christ's Work. And then having fully discharged toward those who deny the evangelical purpose of God in the non-elect the part of Christian charity, I may very safely leave judgment with the Lord. It has by the parties in question, but always without scriptural proof, been very boldly, very confidently asserted, that for all those evangelical dealings which with a view to the eternal glorification of His name Jehovah has seen fit to have with the non-elect, there is no shadow, no faint vestige of equitable ground. Before closing this argument vindicatory of the divine rectitude, therefore, it is of high importance that I bring this assertion also into judgment, and upon evidence absolutely incontrovertible, openly and to the uttermost condemn.

The rationalistic error to which I here allude, is with indifferent accuracy set forth as follows. Because under that glorious half of the Eternal Covenant or New Testament in the blood of Christ commonly called the "Covenant of Grace," the Work of Christ *has* for actual deliverance of the elect been by the Father accepted—because through its acceptance for this design, the whole body of the elect have to the eternal glorifying of the divine love been as an inalienable inheritance decreed to the Son—because also for securing to Him this inheritance covenant engagements for the spiritual quickening, conversion, justification, and sanctification of these chosen vessels have been ordained and ratified—and because through the divine faithfulness to those engagements, the church elect, even to her last member, shall in the faultlessness of Christ's righteousness be safely gathered to the right hand of God ; because, for the absolute securing of all this, the Work of the Son *has* by the everlasting Father been ordained and expressly accepted, therefore, (for thus runs the antiscritptural deduction of those who rely upon human reason), there can be, and there is, no remaining ground upon which in connexion with the non-elect *Jehovah can carry out an evangelical purpose ; in plain words,*

lay before such parties a free proffer of life, and exercise as Supreme Ruler his prerogative, by authoritatively calling to repentance and faith.

Such the argument: it may at a glance be seen to proceed upon a series of facts in connexion with the elect—AND TO IGNORE ALL ELSE. Ere proceeding in the present chapter thoroughly to deal with it, I first, to the end that the minds of inquirers may be disabused of gratuitous prejudice, take occasion very explicitly to state: that I do *not*, as by the malice of parties systematically mendacious represented, believe, nor have I at any time for a moment dreamed, that any beside the elect of God will ever finally be saved. This gratuitous falsehood, of course, suits admirably the evil purpose of the lying spirits who have devised it; which is, through deceiving the souls of the simple, to excite, and if possible perpetuate, invincible hostility to wisdom and purpose of Jehovah. But be it specially observed, that for such gratuitous falsehood, *these slanderous, these boldly mendacious deceivers have received no authority from me.* If therefore such highly unprincipled persons have of a truth received a communication of this kind—that is, if the lie which they have propagated be not a gratuitous emanation of their own heart, but an invention accepted at the hand of another—then, it is self-evident, that it can only be on the testimony of him of whom it is written, that “*he was a liar from the beginning.*” For to no party less respectable, I am inclined to think, could invention thus gratuitous be with reason for a moment imputed. But, be the authorship of whom it may, that truth which I *do* hold, and shall against the utmost malice of Satan and his party here make good, is, that over and above the certain, the infallible salvation by Christ of the elect, the Lord God by that very way which throughout the pages of the New Testament He has unfolded—that is, on the strength of His own gospel, and its free proffer of mercy and peace—WILL AS SURELY AS HE HIMSELF IS HOLINESS, JUSTICE, TRUTH, BE GLORIFIED IN THE CONDEMNATION OF THE NON-ELECT. But with respect to the probability of the salvation of these, why the very force of the testimony which in justification of Jehovah I am about to adduce, does, in my humble judgment, absolutely dissipate the slightest hope of it.

The question for discussion in this chapter then being, the sufficiency or non-sufficiency in equity of the grand Work of Christ to sustain the evangelical purpose of God in the non-elect, that which I have to ascertain is, whether the verdict of my ultra-Calvinistic opponents who deny its all-sufficiency is just, consequently has the sanction of Scripture; or whether a judgment very much more respectful toward the Work of Christ, is that

which enjoys the seal of the divine approbation? Once more therefore in defence of the glory of Him who hath redeemed me with blood, commending to the God of battles the result, do I, His poor militant servant, lay hold upon buckler and spear. The Lord aiding, I shall give that antisciptural opinion which would so gratuitously, so causelessly detract from the wisdom of God in His Son's Work, to the same fate as its rationalistic fellows which have gone before.

As I am anxious that upon a point so vital, the proof, without being too protracted, should be of the very weightiest character, therefore, without systematically adducing the multitudinous minor heads of evidence, I shall, by the following threefold refutation of the *foul* dogma of the *NON-sufficiency* of the Work of Christ, effectually establish that more God-glorifying truth of its *ALL-sufficiency*, which by Jehovah I am commissioned to defend. I shall prove then,—

FIRST. That this antisciptural dogma, could it indeed be substantiated, would infallibly have for its effect, *to vitiate* that ratification which through the divine act of setting upon the page of the New Testament the great seal of Christ's blood, has in the presence of heaven, the earth, and hell, been to that Grand Eternal Covenant imparted: nor this alone, but worse; would absolutely *profane* the integrity of Jehovah in that Covenant.

SECONDLY. That this antisciptural dogma could it indeed be established, would in addition to the great evil set forth in the foregoing proposition infallibly have for its effect, *to impeach* all the wisdom, all the stipulations, and all the acts of the Eternal Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as found under that part of the Grand Eternal Covenant or New Testament in the blood of Christ which in spite of its Calvinistic burial I have exhumed, brought forth from the grave, and distinguished as the Covenant of Equity.

AND THIRDLY. That this antisciptural dogma could it indeed be substantiated, over and above the stupendous evils set forth in the two foregoing propositions would infallibly have for its effect, to falsify and hold forth as a hissing and mockery for ever, the very weightiest, the most deeply solemn, nay! without exception the most sublimely awful enunciations which through the Spirit of God in the Incarnate Son, and His elect Apostles, have ever from on high been delivered: nor this alone, but by so doing, would with equal infallibility render all the remainder of the Bible, yea! to the very elect themselves, a record faithless, untrustworthy, unreliable.

Now any theological proposition which by the page of inspiration can be fairly demonstrated to be of a character thus discrepu-

table, ought, in the case of every Christian or sanctified mind, to need nothing more for its rejection with unqualified censure, its condemnation with loathing and disdain. To the work of such needful demonstration, with a view to the due execution of the office entrusted me, to wit, the conduct of the argument for the case of Jehovah, do I now very confidently turn.

HEAD I. In support of the grand truth, that the Work of Christ is abundantly efficacious to sustain the divine purpose in the non-elect, I have in the first place to show, that the dogma of non-sufficiency in that Work, STANDS AT OPEN ANTAGONISM WITH THE GREAT SEAL OF BLOOD WHICH HAS BEEN PLACED UPON THE ETERNAL COVENANT OR NEW TESTAMENT: NAY! WORSE; ABSOLUTELY PROFANES THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD IN THAT COVENANT.

In the immediately foregoing chapter I have taken special care to prove, that while the Eternal Covenant or New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ is but One, yet it consists of two distinct parts, both, in the very highest degree, important to the glory of God: the former, or Covenant of Equity, bearing exclusively upon the non-elect; the latter, or Covenant of Grace, having exclusive reference to the elect. In the same chapter, moreover, on the foundation and exclusive authority of the written Word, I have further taken care to establish the fact, that both these distinct parts of the one Grand Eternal Covenant, because bearing exclusively on law-breakers and rebels, *have effect, and can only have*, through that divine seal by virtue of which the said Covenant has been ratified: for without such seal, there could in support of either of its two component parts, have been no actual, no equitable ground. In proof of these facts, let the reader hear the word of the Spirit at the lips of Immanuel: it is written,—“Drink ye all of it; *for this is MY BLOOD OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.*” (Matt. xxvi. 27.) In this solemn passage, and from the lips of Him who never erred we have it clearly intimated, that the blood of His own holy humanity poured out unto the death as a law-magnifying sacrifice, is the righteous, ay! sole ground upon which the Grand Eternal Covenant of Jehovah (to wit, all that it holds, stipulates, and guarantees) has been devised, ratified, and promulgated. It is then worse than vain, for ultra-Calvinistic theologians to endeavour to overthrow that fact; for it stands impregnable as the very throne of Jehovah. Consequently, to my office as the Lord’s witness it pertains to lay it down, *that whatever in the shape of evangelical overture, invitation, command, exhortation, call, or conditional promise to the non-elect, is contained in the New Testament, finds, and can find place there, solely and exclusively IN CONSE-*

QUENCE OF THE LAW-MAGNIFYING BLOOD OF CHRIST. And I here for the sake of thoroughly sifting theological sentiment, cordially invite the entire host of my ultra-Calvinistic antagonists, if they think themselves equal to the task, to refute it.

Doubtless, by way of objection, it will by such parties be submitted, 'Is it not in the passage to which you have referred most explicitly asserted, that this blood of the New Testament is shed *for MANY, (not ALL)*, for the remission of sins ; and does not that necessarily limit the virtue of that blood to the case of the elect ? This weak cavil, I meet with a flat negative : I say, No ; certainly not. Hear then the reason. I freely concede that it is quite true, nay ! not merely true but self-evident, that that remission of sin through blood which is here spoken of, applies, and can only apply to the elect : for if it were not so, then would none of the race of Adam go down to the pit,—seeing that remission of sin through blood, necessarily prevents the necessity of legal damnation. Nothing therefore can be plainer than the fact, that the blood of Christ as shed *under express intention* to bring remission of sin to many, in other words, everlastingly deliver that many from sin's condemnation and curse, has the effect which was intended ; that is, does actually bring to the many here spoken of a free remission ; does certainly deliver them from condemnation or legal curse ; and these parties, indisputably, must be those, whose names through the divine predestination of their owners to glory, have from before the foundation of the world been engraved in the Lamb's book of life. These, of course, are the elect ; and the elect alone. But while all this is most freely granted, is moreover *that* which even unto the death I feel bound to defend, yet it has no connexion whatever with that grand truth, which notwithstanding its long burial by ultra-Calvinistic theologians of the P. R. Baptist Churches and others, I am here intent upon digging up, raising from the tomb, and setting forth full in the light. For while I have freely conceded it to be a fact, that one stipulation of the Grand Eternal Covenant of Christ is, that through His blood the elect shall receive remission of sin, what has that fact to offer against the noble truth which I here drag from the grave, to wit, that the precious blood of the Son of God is the foundation—sole foundation—of the *entire* Covenant, that is, of the whole glorious substance of the New Testament ? Such objectors as I here anticipate would seem to be utterly incompetent to detect the fact, that *one* distinct stipulation of the Great Covenant ratified by the blood of Christ, cannot remove the ratifying seal of that blood from the *other* numberless stipulations of the same Covenant. Now all these stipulations, whether in connexion with the elect or non-elect, *being purely evangelical, and in*

no sense whatever legal, do all stand, yea ! can only stand, in the blood of the Lamb. It would be well for such objectors, if indeed they lay claim to the intellectual faculty of discrimination, to take note, that in the stubborn passage which from the Saviour's lips I have quoted, are couched two distinct facts ; and not merely one fact, as is by the objection too evidently implied. Of these two facts, distinct and weighty, the first is this, That the equitable foundation upon which the Grand Eternal Covenant of Jehovah has been set up, is the blood of the Lord Jesus Christ : but the second is this, that the mercy under one stipulation of that part of the Eternal Covenant called the Covenant of Grace, is, the remission to the elect of sin : as it is written,—“By the blood of thy covenant *I have sent forth* thy prisoners out of the pit wherein is no water.” (Zech. ix. 11.) Assuming then that the objectors at length vouchsafe to look these two facts in the face, I press home the pertinent enquiry, Because remission of sin is one mercy which under the New Testament in the blood of Christ has been stipulated on behalf of the elect, and because in the passage upon which the objection is raised Christ alludes to that mercy, will that necessarily remove from the many other blessings of the same Covenant for which on behalf of the elect stipulations have been made, the ratifying seal of the Saviour's blood ? It is answered, Nay. And why ? The objector answers, Because those other merciful stipulations form distinct clauses in the very same Covenant, every part of which has been set up upon the blood of Christ, and under seal of that precious blood ratified. I reply, Good : then, my very adversaries being judges, it is now incontestibly proved, that the whole Eternal Covenant or New Testament has its existence exclusively through blood. Extend then the inquiry to that part of this Grand Eternal Covenant which lies beyond the immunities of the elect, and see how the case will stand. I ask, if in the passage under consideration the express mention by Christ of the mercy of remission of sin through His blood, cannot remove the seal of that blood from any of the other glorious stipulations made on behalf of the elect, and that simply because those stipulations form distinct clauses of the very same Covenant, which Covenant in its entirety stands ratified by the blood of Christ, then, can any further portion of that identical Covenant ratified by His blood, no matter upon whom it may bear, *have the ratifying seal of that blood removed from it* ? In his own despite, my objector is at length constrained to answer, ‘Nay.’ I turn from him without further waste of words, saying, Then by your own admissions the case is to the very uttermost against you : for the Covenant of Equity, or *evangelical covenant which*

bears exclusively upon the non-elect, forms exactly one half of the divine purpose and stipulation as found under the New Testament.

Having now in absolute defiance of objection established the grand fact, that the Eternal Covenant of Christ, or New Testament, throughout its whole length and breadth stands ratified by the precious blood of Christ, I next, as preliminary to the proof immediately in hand, take occasion to point out, that this fact being conceded, has for its infallible effect to establish the two following conclusions: first, that the dogma blindly as magisterially by ultra-Calvinistic theologians asserted, to wit, that the Lord Jesus Christ shed His blood or died to redeem and save the elect alone, although when in the sense of *intention actually and certainly to save* considered, strictly true, is nevertheless a mere GARBLED STATEMENT: and secondly, that the conclusion which with triumph altogether premature they evolve from it, viz., that therefore there is no just, no all-sufficient ground in the Work of Christ for the progress of the divine purpose in the non-elect, is ABSOLUTELY FALSE. For mark: that if as I have proved above, the New Testament in its entirety has been ratified by the seal of Christ's infinitely precious blood, then, forasmuch as that Document contains within itself the entire Covenant of Equity, it is manifest, that It has *not* as by human ignorance asserted been set up for the salvation of the elect alone; but for all things which, as by the finger of God engraved upon its sacred page, and by the said seal of blood publicly ratified, have thus been rendered irrevocable. That is, first, for consummating under that portion of it entitled the Covenant of Equity, all *that* concerning the non-elect, which in the counsels of eternity had by Infinite Wisdom been foreordained: and secondly, for carrying into effect under that other portion of it entitled the Covenant of Grace, all *that* concerning the elect, which in the counsels of eternity had by Infinite Wisdom been predetermined. But if the design of Jehovah be indeed thus extensive, then, when without explanation it is by ultra-Calvinistic theologians perseveringly and magisterially asserted, that the Lord Jesus Christ shed His blood or died to redeem and actually save the elect, and the elect alone, it is evident, that that statement, although when in the sense of *intention actually and certainly to save* considered, strictly and momentarily true, is nevertheless a statement carefully picked out from a number of other or sister statements, which with equal plainness have by the finger of God been engraved on the page of the New Testament: hence, is undeniably, and manifestly, A GARBLED STATEMENT. So much with regard to the act, of choosing and insulating special portions of the truth-witnessing Scripture. And with reference to that false conclusion drawn from

picked statement, which with triumph altogether premature is by the parties thus illegally acting at all times very stupidly vaunted, to wit, that the grand Work of Christ is *not* an actual ground for the evangelical purpose of Jehovah in the non-elect, let the reader of his courtesy be pleased to observe. That if beside that special statement which for the sake of their theological system these theologians do so industriously, so indefatigably pick out or choose, there remain behind upon the glorious page of the New Testament a number of other or sister statements; and if many of these do immediately and explicitly bear upon that portion of the human race called the non-elect, thus exhibiting to angels above and devils beneath a positive purpose on the part of God in connexion with those parties; and if all these sister statements which by finger divine have been engraved upon the page of the New Testament be to the full as much as the garbled statement of the ultra-Calvinistic theologians ratified by the broad seal of the blood of Christ; and if by virtue of that ratifying seal, God not merely intends to act upon them, but through the agency of His Son, the inspired Apostles, and tens of thousands of His sanctified ministering servants beside, has for near nineteen hundred years carried out that intention; then, by every unprejudiced party, nay! even by ultra-Calvinistic theologians themselves it must of necessity be admitted, that in absolute defiance of their garbled statement which in the sense indicated I freely admit to be true, the conclusion to which on the strength of it they have arrived, to wit, that because it is true, therefore, there is no just, no all-sufficient ground in the Work of Christ for the progress of the divine purpose in the non-elect, is a mere deduction of their own natural reason, and—AN ABSOLUTE FALSEHOOD.

But another and equally admirable vantage ground from which this practice peculiar to ultra-Calvinistic theologians, to wit, of dealing in mere garbled statement may with the utmost clearness be reviewed, is that of the *eternal*, or as Peter designates it, "*determinate counsel of God*." For the sake of still further confirming to my reader the fact, that that inadmissible practice which I have not hesitated to impute to these parties exists, I for one brief moment avail myself of the said vantage ground. Hear then that truly remarkable declaration at the lips of Peter, which under altogether extraordinary anointing of the Holy Ghost he was led to make, when on the day of Pentecost preaching into the ears and hearts of Christ's very murderers both the solemn warning and free gospel of God. The passage runs thus,—"*Him (Jesus of Nazareth) being delivered by the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God ye have taken and by wicked hands have crucified and slain.*" (Acts ii. 23.) In this passage is a plain

declaration, that the act of surrendering the holy humanity of Christ into the hands of His enemies, was part, but only a single part, of the *eternal counsel of Jehovah*; an act clearly apprehended by the divine foreknowledge, yet in the *determinate counsel of Jehovah* permitted. But where, I ask, are we to look for the corresponding part of that determinate counsel of God, in accordance with which, and to form a righteous ground for the progress of which, Christ was delivered up? By my adversaries themselves it is replied, 'The New Testament.' Good, I respond: but is it to be the whole of the New Testament, or only a garbled statement at the pleasure of ultra-Calvinistic theologians? If no garbled statement, but the whole New Testament, then, I aver, that as part, and a very important part of Jehovah's counsel, that Testament over and above the stipulations of a Covenant of Grace bearing on the elect, contains those of a Covenant of Equity bearing exclusively upon the non-elect; and both these, as the corresponding parts of one New Testament, stand ratified by the blood of Christ. When then, seizing upon the single idea of INTENTION—*Christ's fixed, Christ's unalterable INTENTION infallibly to redeem and save from destruction His people*—ultra-Calvinistic theologians strenuously contend for the fact, that Christ shed His blood or died for the elect, and for them alone; it is evident, that admitting in *that particular sense* their assertion to be strictly true, yet the fact remains, that all this strenuous contending on their part, proceeds upon a single truth which they have carefully picked out, and separated from the corresponding part of Jehovah's counsel; or in other and very plain words, their magisterial insisting that Christ died for the elect, and the elect alone, amounts to a mere GARBLED STATEMENT. For yonder in their despite, and to the visual faculty of mind palpable, stands side by side with the Covenant of Grace the Covenant of Equity. And, alas! for the strenuous insisting—alas! for the garbled statement of *such* theologians—these two Covenants are but the two halves of one Grand Eternal Covenant of Jehovah; which Covenant, throughout, or in all in its parts, was set up upon the predestined foundation of Christ's blood; and has, by His actual shedding of that blood, been both publicly and irrevocably ratified.

By an instrumentality altogether unexceptionable, to wit, the infallibility of divine assertion, I have now unmasked the garbled statement of the ultra-Calvinists, and established in perpetuity two facts. The first, that the precious blood of Christ is the ratifying seal not of a part only, but of the entire New Testament—the whole Eternal Covenant of Jehovah. The second, that that *precious blood* was shed, not as by ultra-Calvinists stated,

merely for the salvation of the elect, *but for the carrying out of ALL THOSE PURPOSES, which in the inscrutable counsels of eternity HAD BY THE CONFEDERATED PERSONS OF THE HOLY TRINITY BEEN DETERMINED.* Upon the strength of these two facts, therefore, I am now in a position to shew, that THE DOGMA of those who deny the evangelical purpose of God in the non-elect—DOGMA, I mean, of the non-existence of a just ground in the Work of Christ for the free progress of that purpose—STANDS AT OPEN ANTAGONISM WITH THE GREAT BLOOD SEAL, by virtue of which the Eternal Covenant throughout its length and breadth, has in the presence of angels and archangels been irreversibly ratified.

The conclusion to this effect which I now draw, is exceedingly simple, inasmuch that the veriest child may understand it. Observe then, first, that if as I have shewn and proved, the precious blood of Christ be the ratifying seal of the whole Eternal Covenant or New Testament, then, it is clear, that in the fact of that blood having as a ratifying seal been by hand divine placed upon the said Instrument, we have God's practical assurance to the effect, that the death of the august Victim ratifying such Covenant, is to the very uttermost sufficient as a ground—most righteous ground—upon which to perfect every sublime determination recorded in that Covenant. Had the seal of Christ's blood not thus faithfully attested the all-sufficiency of the death of the Divine Victim, it never would by the equitable hand of the God of Israel have been placed on His Covenant. Its presence there, is in fact the permanent, the perpetual asseveration of the Triune Jehovah—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost—that the death of the Incarnate Deity, in other words, the law-magnifying WORK OF CHRIST, is in equity infinitely sufficient for the righteous progress of all the divine purposes; every purpose, which from a past eternity, had in the secret Council of the Trinity been contemplated—every purpose, which for a record before man, has by the finger of God in the New Testament been engraved. Thus much then on the side of Jehovah. But now at the mouth of those who deny the evangelical purpose God in the non-elect, have we in direct contradiction of all the above solemn verities the highly injurious assertion, that the Lord Jesus Christ having in no sense whatever died for the non-elect—that is, *with the intention of making way for an evangelical purpose bearing on them*—therefore, there is not only no all-sufficiency in His Work, but no dim vestige, no faint shadow of ground, upon which with these parties the Father may conduct an evangelical dealing. Thus much on the side of the ultra-Calvanistic theologians. But now, if the assertion of these divines were true, it is at a glance evident, that that ratification which through the placing by hand

divine of the great seal of blood upon the New Testament that Instrument has received, is absolutely vitiated. For if when there was positively *no* ground on which toward the non-elect to conduct an evangelical purpose, Jehovah have nevertheless as though there *were* such a ground ratified with a seal of blood the New Testament, then, despite this wrong act on the part of God there being in reality no ground, the fact remains, that the seal of blood which by way of ratification has been placed upon the said Document, has been placed there illegally. And the seal of blood being at length openly manifested to have been illegally applied, the whole ratification or confirmation of the New Testament which through means of such false application was intended, is ABSOLUTELY VITIATED. But now, granting for a moment that Jehovah were a God thus reckless of law, truth, equity, comeliness, character, decency, then, the Supreme Ruler being *such*, what security for their everlasting hopes could the very elect themselves have in Him? For if in defiance of all that is sacred He will for no valid reason violate rectitude in the case of the non-elect, what I demand should hinder Him, upon any, the merest caprice, from dealing in a similar way with the very elect? And again, if the seal placed upon one half of the New Testament be there placed under full knowledge of the flagrantly dishonest character of the act, then, notwithstanding the act of placing the same degraded seal upon the other half of the same Testament, what be it asked shall guarantee the elect at last from proving it of a character equally, or even more flagrantly dishonest? Let those who deny the all-sufficiency of the sacrifice of Christ, answer: it will be one stone of stumbling and of offence removed from the path of their rationalistic theory.

Upon the conscientious reader in the Name of God I now call, to behold and of his candour admit, the accomplishment of that which I had undertaken to prove: to wit, the highly indecorous, the utterly injurious manner in which that rationalistic assumption which I refute, does ACTUALLY MILITATE AGAINST THE GREAT BLOOD SEAL OF THE ETERNAL COVENANT OF JEHOVAH—THE NEW TESTAMENT.

But under this particular head of argument be it remembered, there is a yet further point which I stand pledged to prove: to wit, that in addition to the above vitiating of that ratification which through divine seal has been vouchsafed to the New Testament, this reprehensible dogma of non-sufficiency in the Work of Christ to sustain evangelical relations with the non-elect, does absolutely profane the integrity of Jehovah in that Covenant.

Observe then, that if as I have affirmed, and proved, the ratifying blood of the Lord Jesus Christ has by God been placed upon

the Eternal Covenant or New Testament as a sign, seal, token, that the death of the August Victim ratifying that Covenant, is as an equitable ground on which to carry out all the divine purpose amply or to the uttermost sufficient, then, it is clear, that by this divine act the Lord has designed to represent to His creatures, that in all His purposes, (those bearing upon the non-elect included), He, with the most scrupulous regard for His exalted character, proceeds exclusively by the way of equity. In plain words, He would prove the Immaculate Deity to be righteous. Had he not by the seal of Christ's blood designed to prove this, such seal would never by His glorious hand have been set upon that portion of the New Testament which bears upon the non-elect. Its presence upon that special portion of the said Instrument, is the sign—the practical, the perpetual asseveration of the Triune Jehovah—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost—that in all His evangelical purposes, (those bearing on the non-elect included), the Lord is in rectitude unimpeachable. Thus much for the design of Jehovah. But now at the lips of those who deny the evangelical purpose of God in the non-elect, have we in contradistinction to the above comely design the rationalistic assertion, the dreadfully God-dishonouring conclusion, that Christ having in no sense whatever died for the non-elect, that is, *with intention to make way for evangelical dealings with them*, therefore, there is not merely no all-sufficiency in His Work, but no vestige, nay! not the bare shadow of a ground upon which in His act of calling these parties to repentance and to faith, the Gospel-giver may be justified. Thus much on the side of the ultra-Calvinistic theologians. Mark then, that if as by the dogma of these theologians set forth, there be no sufficiency in the Work of Christ for the evangelical purpose of God in the non-elect, then, there can by no possibility be place for a covenant bearing on the non-elect, or Covenant of Equity; and if no place for it, then, certainly no shadow of righteousness in the act, either of entering it upon the page of the New Testament, or publicly ratifying under the broad seal of Christ's blood. But nothing can be more triumphantly established than the fact, that in the Eternal Covenant or New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ, God *has* made place for the Covenant of Equity, for it forms exactly one half of that august Instrument. Moreover, nothing can possibly be more clearly substantiated than the sister fact, that God *has* upon the Covenant of Equity, or corresponding half of that New Testament which has been delivered to His creatures, placed the ratifying seal of His Son's blood: for it is written,—“Drink ye all of it; for (*fact first*) this is my blood of the New Testament, which (*fact second*) *is shed* for many for the remission of sins.” If then the rational-

istic deduction of the ultra-Calvinistic theologians were indeed reliable, in other words, if the dogma by which Christ's grand Work is dishonoured were certainly true, then, in His twofold act, first, the act of having a Covenant of Equity bearing exclusively on the non-elect, and secondly, in placing as a sign or guarantee upon that Covenant the ratifying blood of Christ, Jehovah would be absolutely unrighteous. Here then proved and established stands the second head of the charge which I had undertaken to make good: to wit, that that grossly false, that utterly unwarrantable dogma of the parties with whom I contend, does not merely militate against the great blood seal of the Eternal Covenant, but worse, DOES ACTUALLY AND MOST CAUSELESSLY PROFANE THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF THE IMMACULATE GOD IN THAT COVENANT.

Having now, by comparing it with the Covenant of Christ, proved the contrariety of the tenet which I am examining, not simply to the integrity of the New Testament, but the righteousness, the moral glory of Jehovah, I in the next place proceed to exhibit it under head second of its offending against all that may be counted high and sacred. Its delinquency under this head also, will I doubt not be found to the full as great, as under that which has just been considered.

HEAD II. In support of the grand truth, that the Work of Christ is abundantly efficacious to sustain the divine purpose in the non-elect, I have in the second place to show, that the base dogma of non-sufficiency in that Work, STANDS AT OPEN ANTAGONISM WITH ALL THE WISDOM, ALL THE STIPULATIONS, AND ALL THE ACTS OF THE FATHER, THE SON, AND THE HOLY SPIRIT, as set forth throughout that entire portion of the Eternal Covenant or New Testament, which I have designated the Covenant of Equity.

In dealing with this part of my refutation, the first preliminary proposition which I deem it indispensable to submit is, that such things as acts and stipulations of kinds, do of necessity take rise and have effect from a producing cause. And the producing cause from which in general such acts and stipulations take their rise, is the wisdom, more or less, of the parties thus acting and stipulating. If so, then, the acts and stipulations of Jehovah, if by any means such may be found, must also be admitted to spring and have effect from a producing cause: that cause, the Lord's high and inscrutable wisdom. This being admitted, be it next enquired, Are there at the hand of Jehovah to be found any acts and stipulations, bearing *not* on the elect; existing *not* under that particular half of the New Testament entitled the Covenant of Grace; having *not* reference to the gracious overrule of human wickedness

by the power of the Holy Spirit ; but contrariwise, bearing exclusively on the non-elect ; existing only under that particular half of the New Testament entitled the Covenant of Equity ; and originating exclusively through the Supreme Ruler having determined to require of creatures who have done amiss that which is just ? In the chapter immediately preceding I have very explicitly proved, that there are in the eternal counsels of the Father and the Son such stipulations ; and in chapters first and second of the argument for the case of Jehovah, I have abundantly shewn, that there are in the special providence of the Father and the Son such corresponding acts. Here then, proven and established, are both acts and stipulations not under the Covenant of Grace, nor in connexion with the elect ; but under another Covenant, and in connexion with the non-elect ; to wit, under the Covenant of Equity. Such acts and stipulations, therefore, are things which spring and have effect from an infinitely glorious producing cause, to wit, eternal, divine, altogether transcendent and infinite wisdom.

The second preliminary proposition which in dealing with this head of my refutation I have to submit is, that wisdom, divine, eternal, and infinite, can conceive nothing, approve nothing, establish nothing, which is contrary to the equity, the moral glory, the immaculate holiness of its august Author ; for a contrary part, would be absolute ruin to its claim as an enlightened principle. If this be granted, then, in all those acts and stipulations with respect to the non-elect, which from their producing cause, divine and infinite wisdom, we have in that special half of the New Testament entitled the Covenant of Equity, the divine wisdom not having acted against the equity, moral glory, and immaculate holiness of Jehovah, it is evident, that such acts and such stipulations are, to an extent by the spirit of man altogether incalculable, for the magnifying of those exalted, those transcendently excellent qualities.

The third and last preliminary proposition which in dealing with this head of my refutation I have to submit is, that since in all those acts and stipulations bearing upon the non-elect, which we have under that special half of the New Testament called the Covenant of Equity, the divine wisdom has not acted contrary to the equity, moral glory, and immaculate holiness of the Deity, but rather for their greater exaltation, therefore, it is evident, that all such acts and stipulations of the Father and the Son, must not only by the most searching principle of truth and rectitude be able to bear testing, but by the test, the divine equity, moral glory, and holiness at their root, be evidenced to shine brighter and brighter.

But if upon examination by the dogma of the ultra-Calvinists, (*to wit, of non-sufficiency in the grand Work of Christ*), the acts and stipulations of the Father and the Son under the Covenant of Equity, will not bear inspection; if the divine equity, moral glory, and holiness, which must be admitted to be at their root, be *not* by the test proved to shine the brighter, but contrariwise, to be clouded, darkened, dissipated; if the divine character be not merely impaired, but rendered so dreadfully offensive as to be by the moral sense of even fallen humanity not for a moment tolerable; then, nothing more it may reasonably be imagined can be needed, in order to demonstrate this Christ-dishonouring notion, altogether unholy, indefensible, nay! abominable. Now all this, through radically testing by the dogma at issue God's acts and stipulations under the Covenant of Equity, I shall take care most effectually to establish. It will then to every Christian spirit remain a question, whether the rectitude of the Immaculate Deity, or the vain deductions of sin-blinded reason, have the greater claim to be revered and exalted.

By a reference to the preceding chapter it may as I have said be clearly ascertained, what are THE SEVERAL STIPULATIONS which in the Covenant of Equity are chosen, and have through the seal of the blood of Christ been irrevocably ratified. While THE POSITIVE ACTS corresponding to these chosen, blood-ratified stipulations, as by the Son of God and his inspired Apostles with high hand absolutely accomplished, will be found in chapter first of the case for Jehovah. Now these acts, and stipulations, must of necessity have a nature or moral character of some kind. That is, they must as to kind, nature, character, be either legal on the one hand, or evangelical on the other; equitable on the one hand, or inequitable on the other; holy on the one hand, or absolutely wicked on the other. It is not possible, let the reader of his courtesy observe, that they should be natureless, characterless, nondescript. It would, of course, comport well enough with the antiscriptural dogma of the ultra-Calvinistic theologians, in this light tacitly to regard them: but dealing such as that, I take occasion to bar. These acts and these stipulations—acts and stipulations which, with express view to demonstrate that in His complicity therewith He is not ashamed, the Lord has with His own finger engraved upon the page of the New Testament—even these, do I, upon this broad and unassailable ground, to wit, the purely moral and intellectual type of the Divine Essence, steadfastly affirm to possess nature and character. The question immediately succeeds, Of what kind—legal or evangelical?

In considering that phase of the question which must neces-

sarily be tested by the law, be it said, that in order to anything being legal, it must absolutely (for in this matter is no alternative) be in consonance with the spirit, intent, and sanction of the law : must also find recognition under the sceptre or at the hand of the Lawgiver. Can all this therefore be predicated of those stipulations and acts of the Father and the Son, which exist under that portion of the New Testament, called the Covenant of Equity? I reply, Nay ; certainly not : for whether in a sense simply ethical considered, or an acceptation exclusively forensic, it is absolutely impossible. Wherein is this seen? In these two facts : first, that the stipulations and acts to which reference is made, are stipulations and acts in connexion with creatures already lapsed under the law ; that is, altogether fallen from legal righteousness, and as a consequence thereof, by the law attainted and condemned ; in one short word, *criminals*, already by the law devoted to death. And secondly, that for such parties, the law *knows* nothing, *keeps* nothing, *admits* nothing, (until honour to the full for the dishonour sustained be rendered), save the execution of its penal sanction on the offender, to wit, eternal damnation. Now are the stipulations of the Father and the Son under the Covenant of Equity stipulations for immediate, unconditional, and merciless damnation? They most assuredly are not. Then it is evident at a glance, that they are not stipulations after the spirit, intent, and sanction of the law, but by some means or other different ; consequently, may on no pretence whatever be designated legal. So much with regard to the stipulations. But next, what of the acts? Are the acts of the Father and the Son under the Covenant of Equity, the acts of seizing according to the penal sanction of the law, and casting down into the fiery damnation denounced by that sanction, those non-elect parties who although according to the law righteously accursed, have nevertheless under the provisions of the Covenant in question been respected? Again I reply, They are not. Then these acts are manifestly not after the law : consequently, may on no pretence whatever be designated legal. So much, in a legal point of view, for the divine acts. Whether therefore in the Covenant of Equity it be the *stipulations* of Jehovah which are considered, or whether it be His positive *acts*, since it is evident that they are not *legal*, they must necessarily be of some other nature, some more gracious character. The question of course arises, Are they then evangelical? In order to be evangelical, they must absolutely (for in this matter is no alternative) be in consonance with the spirit, intent, and sanction of the gospel : must also find recognition under the sceptre or at the hand of the Gospel-giver. Can all this be predicated of the stipulations and acts of the

Father and the Son under that portion of the New Testament in question, to wit, the Covenant of Equity? I reply, Yes; certainly. But wherein is this seen? In these two facts: first, that those stipulations and acts of the Father and the Son to which reference is made, although stipulations and acts bearing upon sinners already lapsed under the law, that is, altogether fallen from legal righteousness and by law justly accursed, are yet *not* unto summary damnation; *but* unto such things as in divine equity, righteousness, holiness, can by no possibility be conceded apart from that special provision, which in the exercise of His divine sovereignty has by Jehovah been ordained through the Son. And secondly, that toward such parties—parties for whom the law *knows* nothing, *approves* nothing, *keeps* nothing save highly merited damnation—the *gracious acts* of the Father and the Son are, first, to appoint a season of forbearance, long-suffering, and sparing mercy; secondly, to deliver on the righteous ground of Christ's Work a proffer of life in the name of Jehovah; and thirdly, as an indispensable condition to the actual reception of the divine gift call to repentance and faith. Then the *stipulations*, most certainly—as certainly also, the *acts* of the Father and the Son under that portion of the New Testament which I have designated the Covenant of Equity—being not after the law but manifestly according to the gospel, are, indisputably, to be held as evangelical. Should any ultra-Calvinistic theologian or divine conceive it to be his duty to refute this allegation, let him forthwith furnish the Church of Christ with his proofs.

But what through thus scripturally examining the case have we now before us? Is it not a series of divine acts and stipulations, not after the law, and *yet* bearing exclusively upon law-breakers; in other words, upon rebels, convicts, and traitors? Here then is deviation—sovereign, mysterious deviation—from the ordinary, the strict, the sole course recognizable under the law. But, by whose authority, be it asked? Certainly not by no authority: equally certain by no subordinate or inferior authority: consequently, or of necessity, by the sovereign authority of Jehovah. But the Lord Jehovah is not as a Moral Governor reckless,—regardless of the sanction of the law and shamefully unrighteous: and if so, then, however much by ultra-Calvinists the fact may be denied, unquestionably, at the root of all the above stipulations and acts which are under the Covenant of Equity, there must positively be some all-sufficient—some unimpeachably righteous—some infinitely glorious foundation or ground. What then that ground? To this question, ay! were it Satan himself who stood at the bar, there can be but one answer, to wit, the Lord Jesus Christ and Him crucified: HIS WORK, in which the all-compre-

hending wisdom of Jehovah has been *competent to discern* the existence of a true sufficiency ; His august sacrifice, in which from a past eternity the deeply scrutinizing power of Mind Divine, has been *able to recognize* an infinitely just, infinitely honourable ground.

But in direct contradiction of these facts and evidences, and upon the strength, exclusively, of the deductions of their own natural reason, ultra-Calvinistic divines cry, 'Nay ; the death or Work of Christ was in no sense whatever undertaken for the non-elect, that is, *with intention to make way for the progress of an evangelical purpose bearing on them* ; of which the infallible consequence is, that there is no such thing as a shadow of righteous ground upon which Jehovah can have evangelical dealings with *their souls*.' Well, notwithstanding that the opinion is altogether gratuitous and unscriptural, yet with a view to exhibit results be the whole false proposition for a moment accepted. What now remains ? This. Either that God the Father, and God the Son, in all those acts and stipulations which exist under the Covenant of Equity, have acted in undisguised contempt of the divine law—that is, most unrighteously ; or else, by those acts and stipulations which are under this Covenant they mean absolutely nothing, but have trifled, juggled, and deceived. Even thus do those theologians and divines, the wisdom and theological opinions of whom I am here radically testing, through unwarrantably deviating from the infallible rule of the Scriptures, (at unawares it may be but not the less certainly), bring upon their Maker and his Redeemer the just charge of iniquity. And thus, as has been said, do they under that particular part of the New Testament in the blood of Christ which bears exclusively upon the non-elect, viz., the Covenant of Equity, practically *impeach all the wisdom, all the stipulations, and all the acts, of the impeccable, the immaculate Jehovah*.

Thus much for that truly erroneous, that highly irreverent theological tenet, which, notwithstanding that the divine wisdom has apprehended, nay ! actually applied to evangelical dealing with the non-elect the all-sufficient ground which exists in Christ's Work, would yet eat up as an atom the glory, swallow at a gulp the length and breadth of the infinite virtue inherent in that Work ; and reduce it—albeit the grandest, the most sublime, and to blind human wisdom the most inscrutable of all works—to nothing more (at least throughout one entire half of the New Testament) than an instrument of shame, of black dishonour, both to the moral glory and infinite intelligence of Jehovah.

But if at length it be frankly admitted, first, that there are under the Covenant of Equity the divine acts and stipulations to which I have pointed ; and secondly, that these not being by

nature legal but evangelical, they must of necessity proceed upon a purely righteous ground, to wit, the grand Work of Christ; then, since not in external or false appearance only, but reality—a sense the most stringent and exalted, purely and unchallengably equitable—the next question which for the case of Jehovah arises is, But how or in what respect are such acts and stipulations thus purely, thus unchallengably just? Now in order to their being equitable it is clear, that by some sufficient means, they must when placed in the balances with the wounded honour of the divine Law be backed by such compensatory satisfaction for the wound, as shall be sufficient to bring the scales to the equipoise; for without this, their existence could by no possibility be by the high principle of equity in Jehovah admitted. Be the question therefore asked, Are those evangelical stipulations and acts of the Father and the Son which are under the Covenant of Equity, and which bear exclusively upon the non-elect, with due regard to the injured honour of the law, or are they not? I answer, They are not merely with due regard thereto, but are so in a sense unutterably sublime and exalted. Wherein is this seen? In these two things: first, that Jehovah who is the Lawgiver, though the step be altogether contrary to the ordinary course of His dealings with sinful creatures under the law, can in the case of the non-elect not only adopt the said stipulations and acts, but in the eyes of His loftiest angels and archangels be justified: and secondly, that Jehovah who is also the Gospel-giver, can, for contempt of His divine goodness thus extraordinarily vouchsafed, not only condemn the same parties to an everlastingly augmented measure of retribution, but in the inmost soul of the holiest of His created intelligences above, be by that judgment transcendently exalted. Here then is the actual, the substantial evidence, that in this departure from the ordinary course of the law which in dealing with the non-elect Jehovah has seen fit to adopt, the evangelical acts and stipulations involved are not in breach of the high and holy principle of equity, but in the strictest accordance therewith. But if so, then, once more the question arises,—How? by what wondrous, what particular way? To this, I very explicitly reply: Through *an original acceptance* by the Eternal Father, of that infiniteness of divine virtue which is inseparable from the law-magnifying Work of Christ, *not simply for the certain salvation of the elect, but over and above their salvation, for all else by mutual consent of the Father and the Son afore determined to be done*; even the carrying out or perfecting of that whole evangelical purpose, which for the instruction of all heaven, the confounding of all hell, had in the counsels of old, of eternity, been in sovereignty most wisely predestined. But if this be true, then, it is self-evident, that in

some distinct way, AND UNDER SOME UNDERSTANDING DIFFERING IN MANY RESPECTS FROM THAT WHICH OBTAINS IN THE CASE OF THE ELECT, Christ must, on behalf of the non-elect, have offered to the acceptance of the Lawgiver meet compensation for the law's wounded honour,—such compensation, as in the case of these non-elect parties was at least equal to form for the righteous progress of the evangelical purpose of the Gospel-giver, a perfectly legal, a purely equitable ground. What then that compensation? To this question, finally and most emphatically I respond, That in offering to the injured majesty of the Law, as a noble compensation for the wound by its honour received, the infinite, the boundless, the inconceivably high honour which through His divine obedience under the law, and fearful death according to the sanction of the law, does to the law necessarily result, CHRIST HATH BY DESIGN AND UNDER EXPRESS STIPULATION, offered that infinite, that incalculably excellent honour, as an all-sufficient ground in equity upon which to carry out or to the uttermost perfect—ay! consummate throughout its whole length and breadth—the evangelical purpose of Jehovah: that is, of the one part, the effectual redemption to God of the entire body of the elect; of the other, the vindication through a free proffer of life to the non-elect, of the exalted nature or moral excellency of the Deity. The one glorious sacrifice of the Lord Jesus Christ therefore, to wit, the infinite, immeasurable virtue inherent in that sacrifice, AS BY THE DIVINE WISDOM ACCURATELY APPLIED TO THE RIGHTEOUS CARRYING OUT OF ALL ITS SUBLIME ENDS, is the unchallengable equity in this case; or in other words, the righteousness and blood of Christ Jesus alone, ADMITTED AND ACCEPTED BY THE SUPREME RULER ON A SEPARATE AND JUST UNDERSTANDING FOR EACH OF HIS PREDESTINED ENDS, is that, exclusively, which to the heart of God himself, the mighty armies of His angels in light, the very devils moreover of the pit, sanctifies under the Covenant of Equity the stipulations of the Eternal Father and the Son.

At this point, I should be simple indeed, were I unprepared to have my ears assailed by that most contemptible of all dogmas, which in support of a position absolutely untenable, has as a matter of polemical expediency, been by a host of ultra-Calvinistic theologians propounded; dogma, I mean, of THE LAW-PLACE: to wit, "*That Christ stood in the LAW-PLACE of His people, and made full satisfaction to the justice of God for their sins; work which He did not do for the non-elect.*" By anticipation I see fit to meet, and thoroughly deal with this sublimely absurd cavil: cavil to the full as intensely ridiculous as that, which with so much ignorance has been set up upon the term "SPIRITUAL ACTS:" the which, in

chapter second of the Argument for the case of Jehovah, I have in perpetuity made over to deserved scorn.

With regard then to this monstrous, or perhaps it would be even more strictly correct to say, utterly *impossible* human notion, be it observed, that it formed no part of the original Calvinism of Calvin, and the Calvinistic or Orthodox- (as they were subsequently called) Churches of the Reformation. Nay. The great French reformer, and all the theologians of his day, held a very different doctrine : held tenaciously to that grand truth, which I here raise up from the dead, and in the glorious name of God once more decree to live : to wit, of the all-sufficiency of the death of Christ for the righteous progress of Jehovah's evangelical purpose in the non-elect. The express admission of Calvin with respect to that death (See Commentaries, 1 John ii. 2.) is this,—*"Christus passus est sufficienter pro omnibus, efficienter pro electis;"* Christ died sufficiently for all but efficaciously for the elect. And again he says,—*"Passus est Christus pro peccatis totius mundi;"* Christ died for the sins of the whole world. It was not until the first half of the seventeenth century, when the theologians of the Orthodox or Calvinistic Churches became embroiled in controversy with the Calvinistic Universalists of the school of Saumur, that in the hope of adding extra logical strength to their position, (which in reality it does not), this loathsome doctrinal error subversive of the all-sufficiency of Christ's Work, was by the theologians of the Orthodox School invented ; to wit, *that in no sense whatever did Christ die for the non-elect.* In order to make good this first doctrinal fraud, as a matter of course there was need of still further theological chicane : hence in due course the utterly impossible, the absolutely monstrous notion, of Christ having occupied THE LAW-PLACE of His people, and in *that place* (forsooth !) ended their responsibility. And for the very same reason for which this notion was originally excogitated, has it by the followers of those who so unwarrantably invented it, been to this day most strenuously defended. It is *not* therefore to be reckoned any part of genuine Calvinism ; but a hideous excrescence ; a development of mere unprincipled expediency ; the corollary of a fraud as entirely anti-Calvinistic, as it is both Christ-contradictory, and palpably and disgracefully antisciptural.

With a view now to deal with this monstrously absurd conceit, let the reader be pleased to note, that if the position contended for were true, that is, if it were a fact that Christ stood in the *place* which has so gratuitously been represented, then, it is self-evident, that He who stands in the LAW-PLACE of His people, must on behalf of that people fulfil the LAW-WORKS, and suffer the LAW-FORFEITURES. In which case, Christ must in His

own person, and after a strictly legal or perfect fashion, first, have performed every act without exception of the life of every individual of that innumerable company constituting His elect Church; and secondly, after full accomplishment of that, must under those incalculably numerous everlasting damnations which according to the penal sanction of the law were due to the aggregate of the saved, Himself in the deepest caverns of hell have been everlastingly damned. A very comely theological proposition—OF A TRUTH! Yet all this, unquestionably, is involved in that most stupidly hideous of all humanly devised dogmas, THE LAW-PLACE: dogma which, without reserve or ruth, I here make over to perpetual hissing. But of course it will instantly be replied, 'Nay; for Christ as to His loftier nature being absolutely divine, and the majesty of His Divinity giving a value altogether infinite to His sacrifice, therefore, that sacrifice, without the incalculably multitudinous legal doings, and without the incomputably numerous eternal damnations pointed to, was enough for the sins of His people.' To which, as I admit, very scriptural apology, with no inconsiderable measure of pity for the pretension of the human wisdom advancing it, I reply, Then at the very first admission, you utterly and for ever annihilate the theological fraud which you seek to defend. For He who stands in the *law-place*, must of necessity do the *law-works*—must also submit to the *law-forfeitures*. But if Christ did *not* do the law-works of His people, and if Christ did *not* submit to the law-forfeitures of that people, then, it is absolutely certain He did *not* stand in the law-place of His people; in which case, He must, undeniably, have occupied some other position; some place in which the infinite value inseparable from His divine sacrifice, could by the Supreme Ruler and Lawgiver be admitted, *instead* of His doing the incalculably multitudinous works, and *instead* of His bearing the incomputably numerous everlasting damnations, which by law were so righteously due to His people; some place in which the infinite value of His sacrifice, as a perfect restitution in equity for the wound which had been inflicted on the honour of the law, could for the consummating of the entire purpose of the Deity, be by the divine wisdom with all accuracy applied. What place then was that? Most emphatically, I reply,—NOT the *law-place* of His people; nay! but the place of ATONEMENT-MAKER TO THE LAW, for such dishonour as by the sin of His people had been cast on that holiest of Institutes. In this character of Atonement-maker to the law, He completes the atonement required, not by Himself doing perfectly the incalculably multitudinous works of the law which His people had done wrongly; nor yet by Himself bearing the incomputably numerous eternal damnations which under the

law had become due to their iniquity ; BUT BY THE OFFERING UP ONCE FOR ALL OF A DIVINE SACRIFICE OF INFINITE VALUE—EVEN THE MAJESTY OF HIS OWN DIVINE PERSON.

But if so, then, let the reader be pleased to mark, that such extraneous substitutionary offering to the law, even though divine, is, and can only be of avail, BY THE ARBITRARY APPOINTMENT, ACCEPTANCE, AND INFINITELY WISE APPLICATION OF THE LAWGIVER. He is not *bound* to appoint, to accept, or to apply it : He may, if He please, cause the law to take its course. But supposing that it should please Him to appoint, accept, and apply it, yet even then that divine and infinitely precious sacrifice or offering is *only available, and can only be efficacious, for those ends which by express stipulation with His Son, the Lawgiver and the Son have themselves seen fit to determine.* Be it therefore with all diligence inquired, What are the ends which by the high contracting parties in this case, have on the strength of the divine sacrifice of the Son been predetermined ? According to the infallible testimony of the Holy Scriptures, the determination of the august Persons in question is exactly that which I have declared it to be : to wit, that the infinite virtue of the said sacrifice be applied for the carrying out or consummating OF ALL THAT, which by the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, had in the counsels of old, of eternity, been apprehended as wise. In plain phrase, it was irrevocably decreed, consequently has on the page of the Eternal Covenant or New Testament been recorded, first, that the infinite virtue of the divine sacrifice should be accepted as a righteous, an all-sufficient ground for the regeneration, sanctification, and everlasting glorification of the elect ; and secondly, as an equally righteous ground upon which to vindicate the immaculate nature of the Supreme Ruler ; that is, an equitable foundation upon which by a free proffer of mercy to the non-elect, to exalt in the presence of angels and archangels the inconceivable moral excellency of Jehovah. Exalt, I say, in absolute defiance of that inexorable severity necessarily inseparable from His lofty position as Lawgiver and Righteous Judge of the universe, the glory of a nature sublimely and fearfully just indeed, but at the same time transcendently beneficent.

But in determined opposition to the last of these great scriptural truths, it is by ultra-Calvinistic divines asserted, ‘ that in no sense whatever did Christ die for the non-elect, that is, *with design to make way for an evangelical purpose toward them* : hence in no sense whatever is there in equity a shadow of ground, upon which Jehovah can with these parties have evangelical dealings and be justified.’ Grant then for a passing moment this remarkably antiscriptural assertion to be true, and what conclusion inevitably

follows? First, that without any accurate application of the infinite virtue of the sacrifice of Christ to the righteous carrying out of that divine purpose which is the root of the Covenant of Equity, the Lord Almighty in every express stipulation, every corresponding act under that Covenant, has, through unrighteous dealing, irremediably ruined as Judge and Lawgiver his fame: and secondly, that in condemning under a Covenant of Equity for which there is absolutely no faint shadow of real ground, His helpless creatures of the non-elect to a greatly augmented measure of eternal damnation, He has in a very high degree aggravated the unrighteousness peculiar to the former dealing, and thus as it were doubly, nay! trebly, dishonoured His once noble Name. Even thus by their rationalistic deviation from Scripture, do our ultra-Calvinistic divines bring down upon their Maker and His Redeemer unbounded reproach: and thus, as has been said, do they under that part of the New Testament in the blood of Christ which bears exclusively on the non-elect, viz., the Covenant of Equity, impeach all the wisdom, all the stipulations, and all the acts of the impeccable, the immaculately pure Jehovah.

We have now before us a most melancholy spectacle—spectacle over which the angels themselves might well weep. To wit, the Lord Jehovah, notwithstanding creature denial of that all-sufficiency in the Work of Christ which constitutes it a righteous ground on which to set up the acts and stipulations of the Covenant of Equity, sternly assuming the existence both of the all-sufficiency and the righteous ground thus denied: yea! and in utter contempt, as much of the logic as the censure of those divines by whom His stipulations and acts are impeached, triumphantly and most determinedly carrying out in the non-elect His design. Thus much, on the one hand, for the wisdom and action of the Deity. But on the other hand, there have we the ultra-Calvinistic divines whom for error I impeach, and at their back nearly the whole lay community of the P. R. Baptist Churches who in contempt of God submit to be by them indoctrinated, publicly, and with a pertinacity which day and night never ceases, not merely judging, but with unconcealed contempt censuring—systematically and most wickedly I say maligning—this most righteous, this absolutely indispensable procedure of Jehovah. Thus do they, who neglect in favour of their own rationalistic deductions the pure shining of the light of revelation, as much at the expense of the integrity of their Maker as by mere creatures of clay it may be done, “sacrifice unto their own net, and burn incense unto their own drag.” (Hab. i. 16).

I have now I assume, very sufficiently proved the second head of argument for the all-sufficiency of the grand Work of Christ;

having under this head clearly shewn, that the theological dogma which is opposed to such all-sufficiency, could it by any means be established, must, to the perpetual joy and triumphing of the powers of hell, infallibly subvert all the wisdom, all the stipulations, and all the acts of the Triune Jehovah in the Covenant of Equity.

HEAD III. In support of the grand truth, that the Work of Christ is abundantly efficacious to sustain the divine purpose in the non-elect, I have in the third place to prove, that the irreverent dogma of non-sufficiency in that Work has for its infallible effect, *to falsify and hold forth as a hissing and a mockery for ever*, **THE VERY WIGHTIEST, THE MOST DEEPLY SOLEMN, NAY! THE MOST SUBLIMELY AWFUL ENUNCIATIONS OF THE SPIRIT OF GOD, which by the lips of the Lord Jesus Christ and his elect Apostles have ever been delivered in the world: thus rendering to the very elect themselves, **ALL ELSE IN THE BOOK OF GOD, FAITHLESS, UNTRUSTWORTHY, AND UNRELIABLE.****

Before touching the actual texts to be adduced, let the reader suffer me to recall to his remembrance the fact, that mind human being but created, has neither the same essence, nor the same properties as Mind Divine; that being finite, it is utterly impossible that it should apprehend or seize with the all-comprehending grasp of the Mind Infinite; that being by origin a mere creature, consequently never designed to be copartner in the counsels of its Creator, it is certain that at no period of its existence, neither in time nor in eternity, shall it be able to know the whole wisdom of God. This fact, if indeed entertained, ought to make the children of men—a race by many degrees not the greatest of God's created intelligences—very humble under the poor spark of their finite, their sin-blinded reason; very apt at, very deferential in the gracious vouchsafements of truth which for human guidance have been deigned from on high. But for what purpose have I suggested this? To the end, that from the very outset of the examination now pending, and before under this particular head I exhibit any part of the inspired testimony, it may on every hand be conceded, that in the deep things of God, mere human incompetency to detect the true relation between this and that, the high equity involved in each and all, can never be admitted as evidence against the existence and reality of those things. Hence if the Lord God and his Christ, have in any divine matter perceived both a relation and an equity indis severable from the souls of the non-elect, and because of this perception have for general information in the Word declared it, it imports nothing that the finite mind of the creature cannot see God's point—can neither trace the relation nor apprehend

the high equity of the matter thus faithfully declared. It is enough, that through the all-comprehending or infinite capacity peculiar to the divine wisdom, God and his Christ have apprehended the righteousness in their own matter, and having thus apprehended, irrevocably appointed and determined it.

With this spiritual maxim then full in view, the deeply interesting question arises, What witnesseth the Scripture with direct reference to the sufficiency and bearing of Christ's death? What by the Son of God and his Apostles is for human guidance set forth? Does Christ, or do they, see fit to concede the allegations of the parties against whose rationalizing I so justly contend? to wit, that His grand and glorious sacrifice is insufficient as a ground in equity for the progress of the divine purpose in the non-elect? Does He ratify with the seal of His sanction the assumption of them, who exalting the deductions of sin-blinded reason would detract from the glory of His great Work, or contrariwise, upon the strength of that infinite, that all-glorious sufficiency which is inseparable from His divine sacrifice, does he actually convict his deadliest enemies as SELF-DESTROYERS? That He *does* go this whole length, let the following altogether unanswerable declaration of His holy lips bear witness. Not merely to souls non-elect, be it observed, but those human fiends who under plea that He had broken the sabbath and said that God was his Father, in the true spirit of hell had determined to kill him, He says,—“And ye have not his (the Father's) word abiding in you: for whom he has sent, *him ye believe not*. Search the Scriptures; for in them ye think ye have eternal life: and they are they which testify of me. **AND YE WILL NOT COME TO ME, THAT YE MIGHT HAVE LIFE.**” (Jo. v. 38—40.)

Ere proceeding to lay hand on the substance of this awfully impressive passage, I conceive it right to request for the following three facts consideration. First, that in the declarations of God, especially those bearing upon human criminality, the divine disapprobation, appointed judgment, and eternal retribution, not only may there be no such thing as inadvertent, random, or reckless statement, but each and every statement advanced, must to the letter, to the very uttermost be true. Secondly, that in making use of the censure contained in the passage above cited, and all similar, the infinitely wise Speaker did so in full view of that fact, which in His public teaching He was ever so deeply interested to maintain; to wit, that He himself, the despised party proclaiming to the children of men the gospel, was the very same—the divine, the all-glorious Being—who by irreversible decree of the Father had been appointed the Judge of quick and dead. *And thirdly*, that by virtue of that very fact—fact that the divine

acher of the gospel is by eternal ordination Judge of all those who despise the gospel—the Son of God stands bound in the day of adjudication of doom, to make good to the last letter and syllable every accusation which either by his own divine lips, or those of expressly inspired Apostles, has been brought against such sinners : as it is written,—“ He that rejecteth me, and receiveth *not my words*, hath one that judgeth him : THE WORD THAT I HAVE SPOKEN, THE SAME SHALL JUDGE HIM IN THE LAST DAY.” (John vii. 48.)

And now with regard to the passage itself, let the reader be asked to observe, that it forms part of a long consecutive discourse continued by Christ throughout thirty verses, and delivered with express design to meet the wickedness of those conspirators, who on a false hypocritical plea were banded together with intent to kill Him. Commencing at the seventeenth verse, that discourse sets forth, first, His true sonship and the perfect conformity of his acts to the eternal counsel of the Father. Secondly, the power through the Spirit to quicken or regenerate corrupt sinners, and bring them into possession of spiritual life ; together with His exclusive right, in honour of His glorious sacrifice, to conduct the solemnities of the judgment. Thirdly, the grand gospel doctrine of salvation free through the “ hearing of faith ;” wit, that clean deliverance from condemnation, and a pass from death under the law unto life in Himself, is the equitable, the all-magnifying result of believing on Him. Fourthly, the literal fact, that through quickening grace the dead in sin and sin *shall* hear his gospel voice, *shall* be made to live ; and contrary to the circumstances which mark the case of unbelievers, *shall* in the great day of the resurrection come forth to His call from their graves, to honour, to glory, and to immortality. Fifthly, that His forerunner John the Baptist bore faithful witness of Him, and for a season they pretended to rejoice in his testimony : nevertheless the testimony of John was not the chiefest of witnesses, but the works committed to Him by the Father ; which works, He, through omnipotent power, was daily in their presence accomplishing. And sixthly, that the Father himself (He means through the divine power in those works, the truth of the ancient Scriptures, and the Holy Spirit at His baptism) bore witness to Him ; but that they suffered not his Father's name to have place in them. Such the leading heads of the testimony which was by the Lord Jesus Christ delivered to his would-be murderers, as set forth in that part of the highly, nay ! intensely evangelical discourse, which precedes the special, the more deeply solemn passage, now radically to be considered.

Will those, who while opposing Jehovah's purpose in the non-elect madly dream that do that August Intelligence service, venture to designate this preaching by which to the uttermost the Son of God condemned His bloodthirsty enemies, either Arminian or legal? With all their acumen, should they search, they will fail to find a single syllable which is not in the very purest spirit of the gospel. Thus much, then, in proof of the evangelical substance of this discourse: substance, I affirm, with the glory of which those to whom it was expressly delivered, will at last have most painfully to do; substance before the truth and faithfulness inherent in which, they will in the dread hour of judgment find themselves stricken dumb, overpowered, stripped of all cloak for hate, and left utterly defenceless.

But with reference to that special clause, which as evidence on the side of Jehovah I have deemed it incumbent on me to cite, be it said, that short though it be, it embodies the seven following distinct truths.

1. That the gospel of Christ *is sent* to the non-elect.
2. That the non-elect contemptuously *despise it*.
3. That their contempt and rejection is *accounted guilt*.
4. That their true wisdom would be *reconsideration*.
5. That the eternal life which they hoped was *in Christ*.
6. That through love of sin they *refused to submit to Christ*.
7. That on true submission Christ *had power to bestow life*.

Of a truth—a goodly array of divine evidence this. If therefore it can satisfactorily be shown, that in the weighty, the awfully solemn passage before us all these things are certainly comprehended, shall it not be the imperative duty of every true Christian within the pale of the P. R. Baptist Churches to demand of those who deny the evangelical purpose of God in the non-elect, “by what authority they do this thing—and who gave them that authority?”

First, then, in proof that the passage declares the gospel to be sent to the non-elect, examine the clause, “ye have not *his word* abiding in you.” What word, I submit? Clearly that, and that alone, of which in the immediately foregoing context Christ had been speaking; viz., the word at the outset of the gospel dispensation proclaimed by John the Baptist—since John, by the Lord himself and the voice in His divine works—and at His baptism, and in the ancient prophets, by the Father through the Eternal Spirit. But what be it asked was the substance or burden of that word? Let the reader once more glance his eye over the several heads of the earlier portion of this most evangelical discourse, as sketched out in a paragraph preceding, and he will have no difficulty in recognizing that substance to be, in the

very purest sense of the term, *salvation*—**SALVATION BY CHRIST THROUGH FAITH.** To whom then preached,—to the elect saints, or to sinners of the non-elect? Let the opponents of Christ's all-sufficiency answer.

Secondly, in proof that the passage shews, that the non-elect parties to whom this evangelical preaching, or preaching of salvation through the cross was sent, contemptuously despised it, let the reader consider the clause, "Ye have not His word (the gospel word spoken of) *abiding in you.*" But in what way, I demand, not abiding in you? Christ himself in the immediately following clause explains, saying, "*for whom he hath sent, him ye believe not.*" Be it asked, therefore, is this non-belief by these parties of that gospel truth which had by Jehovah been submitted, to be accounted a crime worthy to the very uttermost of judicial wrath, or is it not? If the Lord Jesus be admitted to be a competent witness to the several issues of His own gospel, it most certainly is, for he has already declared the non-receiving through unbelief of His words to be a crime punishable with special retribution; saying, "He that receiveth not (that is with a hearing, obedient, or believing ear) *my words*, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him (that is, shall for the contempt manifested toward the proffer of life conveyed therein appear as a swift witness against him) in the last day." If these sayings be true, and if the faithfulness of God be in the highest interested to bring them to pass, then, how I ask shall those who *believe not*, be able to escape the charge of despising both the gospel and the Son of God? Let those who resist the divine wisdom in the case of the non-elect answer.

Thirdly, in proof that for this rejection and contempt of the gospel the passage shews a divine imputation of guilt, let the reader be pleased to mark the clause, "*for whom he hath sent, him ye believe not.*" Who then I ask is He? If those who band together against the evangelical purpose of God in the elect will for once vouchsafe to allow the Son of God himself to answer, they will find, that He whom God hath sent as mentioned in the passage before us, is the very same, who (as by himself declared in the xvth. chapter of John) came by express warrant of the Father to leave *unbelievers of the gospel* no cloak for their sins. That is, to demonstrate practically, or through means of a free proffer of life, the *causeless hate* of these parties to the Son and the Father. And this rejection through causeless hate, of the very sublimest proffer which by Jehovah could have been vouchsafed, although an act which by peculiarity of nature does not transpire within the jurisdiction of the law and Lawgiver, yet being a

heinous wrong before the Supreme God and Gospel-giver, is necessarily in the divine equity imputed to the haters as guilt, and becomes the ground of a distinct condemnation. Hence is by God in the irrevocable Word proclaimed to be, the procuring cause of death unto death—the just reason of a greater damnation. But if all this be so, (and who shall refute it?), then, how by the parties through hate not believing, shall this awful imputation of gospel guilt be evaded? Let the opponents of Jehovah's purpose at their leisure discover.

Fourthly, in proof that the passage shews a gracious endeavour on the part of Christ to instigate non-elect souls to the truest wisdom—the wisdom of reconsideration—let the reader cast eye upon the clause, “*search the scriptures*; for in them ye think ye have eternal life.” But why does Christ thus commend to these Jews the wisdom of searching the Scriptures? The answer is but one—one only—and is this: that they might have their views (false unscriptural views) of eternal life corrected. In connection with this special clause, let the reader take note, that through their descent from Abraham, their national election as the typical people of God, and their form of divine ordinances, these non-elect Jews verily thought with themselves that they had eternal life: in all which hope the Scriptures (misunderstood) being their warrant, in a word, their national Charter of Rights, they clung tenaciously to their false interpretations. But the evangelical preaching of Christ having now exploded the enormous error of eternal election in Abraham—convicted for unbelief of God's gospel—and excited their deepest animosity—the merciful Saviour thus faithfully counsels. “Once more, ye men of Judah, ere you be launched into eternity I commend to you this needful advice, that with all diligence you examine to the root the testimony of your own Scriptures; for in them, ye are wont to think that ye have eternal life, but your interpretations are erroneous; hence the truest wisdom is, that ye carefully search again.” Now if the case be as here represented, then, how shall the non-elect parties to whom this humane advice was tendered, find it possible at the bar of judgment, to justify their carnal, their contemptuous neglect? Again, I say, let the opponents of revealed truth declare how.

Fifthly, in proof that the passage shews, that the eternal life for which these Jews hoped was only to be found in the Son of God, let the reader consider the clause, “and they are they which *testify of me*.” But why on the part of Christ this addition to His counsel, this express reference to Himself? Clearly in order that *that particular point* on which His hearers were thus carefully to examine the Word, viz., Jehovah's righteous way of life through

the incarnation and death of Messiah, might in contradistinction to their foolish interpretations stand out with great prominence before the mind. For though from the Scriptures they verily thought that they (the seed of Abraham) had eternal life, yet were they altogether ignorant of the true, the only just way of life, as revealed in those very testimonies by Jehovah. And the way of life by Jehovah there unfolded, being exclusively through the sacrifice of the Son, as typified by the Levitical sacrifices and attested by all the prophets of the olden day, therefore in the clause "they (the ancient Scriptures) are they which testify of me," the Son of God did in effect graciously declare to these non-elect souls the sum and substance of the entire Bible: as it is written,—“For the testimony of *Jesus* is the spirit of prophecy.” (Rev. xix. 10.) Here again is the very essence of evangelical truth; and if so, then, how in the judgment shall those to whom it was preached be able to evade it? Let the acutest of the opponents of Christ's benevolence once more reply.

Sixthly, in proof that the passage shews that through inveterate love of sin they refused to surrender themselves to Christ, let the reader ponder the clause, “and ye *will not come* to me that ye might have life.” In full view of this unqualified condemnation, be the question proposed, But when the stake was so great, even salvation or life everlasting on the one hand, condemnation or eternal damnation on the other, why would they not come, that is, in heart submit to Christ? There must necessarily have been some deep, some most powerful reason. What then that reason? It is, I submit, such an inveterate, such a deeply-seated love of sin, as operates unto invincible hatred of the Father and the Son; aversion, also, to that life and walk which are according to holiness. The application is as follows. The will is the imperial faculty, the governing power of the intelligent creature—the soul. But the Son of God here bears witness that it is vitiated,—is by some peculiar fatality subordinated to evil. With regard to that fatality, the Holy Scriptures refer every inquirer to the fall of Adam, giving us to understand, that at that point there did in some way pass upon the human constitution a radical corruption,—a moral leprosy, the over-spreading of which is complete: as it is written,—“From the crown of the head to the sole of the foot there is no soundness in it;” and again,—“God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil continually;” and yet again,—“Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.” This constitutional corruption, this moral unsoundness, this radical depravity of heart and imagination it is, through which the governing faculty has become

subordinated to evil. That is, the fallen, corrupt, utterly depraved moral nature, causes dislike to the ways of God or holiness, and a taste for the pleasures of sin. To indulge or gratify which, the imperial faculty of the soul, the will, determines in favour of the most unworthy, ay, even debasing solicitations of the flesh and mind. But a true coming of the soul to Christ, or in other words, its repenting toward God and submitting to His Son, involves the surrender of this despotism of the will—this liberty of self-allowance in sin. Hence the heart and flesh object; and the will, the imperial faculty of the soul, determinedly ratifies the objection; steadfastly, nay! in full sympathy with the heart's hate, rejecting God's proffer of life by Christ Jesus: as it is written,—“But his citizens hated him (that is, Christ), and sent a message after him, saying, *We will not have this man to reign over us;*” and again,—“*Ye will not come to me that ye might have life.*” But if all these scriptural things be true, then, how in the judgment shall the parties of whom they are written be able to hide from the assembled universe the fact, that through sheer love of sin they rejected the free proffer of life in the gospel; yea! hated also, without a cause, the holy person of the Son and of the Father, by whom that gracious proffer was submitted? Let those who to justify man deny the divine purpose, prescribe, if they think themselves competent, a way.

Seventhly, in proof that the passage shews that there is with the Son of God in the event of submission ample sufficiency, consequently full power in righteousness to bestow eternal life, let the reader once and for ever take knowledge of the concluding clause of the passage, viz., “**THAT YE MIGHT HAVE LIFE.**” But how, I steadfastly demand, by their coming to Christ, might these have had life—by what possibility? For mark, the mere fact of their having come to Christ would have been no just ground on which they might have had life. And wherefore? Because such persons were ushered into being, as are all the creatures of Jehovah, under the law; consequently, were subject to its sanctions. But out of an evil, corrupt heart, they had violated every head of the statute: had trampled it in its length and breadth beneath their feet. Now in case like this the righteous sanction of the law is, *not that they MAY HAVE eternal life, but that they SHALL HAVE eternal death—everlasting damnation*: and like the law of the Medes and Persians, this penal sanction altereth not. It is clear then that even had these law-breakers come to Christ, that would have yielded no shadow of just ground on which they *might have had life*. But the Son of God has publicly, in presence of heaven, the earth, and hell, declared—declared it, mark, in full view of the solemnity of His own sitting in judgment—and

therefore, as I have said, stands bound in the day of that judgment to make it good—that if these law-breakers would have come to him, that is, would in repentance or true submission of soul have surrendered themselves at His feet, **THEY MIGHT HAVE HAD LIFE**. If therefore the Eternal Son be as the Scripture avouches, very God of very God, coessential and coequal with the Father, then it is in connexion with God written,—“that it is impossible that He should lie.” There *was* therefore, yea! there positively *must have been* some righteous ground on which, supposing the equitable conditions prescribed to have been fulfilled, Christ stood in a position to bestow upon those whom he censured life. But since it is not possible except under due regard for the majesty of the law, that there should be such a righteous ground; and since the law-magnifying sacrifice of Christ is the sole oblation which extends to the difficulty in this case; it is clear, that by virtue of that grandest of all works, the consummation of which is to be found at the cross, *though it be even non-elect souls that are considered, the Son of God verily HAS POWER according to the strictest rule of righteousness TO BESTOW LIFE*. But if these things be so—and I challenge the ultra-Calvinistic theologians of the whole world to refute them—then, how throughout eternity will these non-elect be able to evade their sad consciousness of the fact, that by a determined act of their own will they rejected God’s equitable proffer of life, and deliberately chose for themselves the law’s righteous damnation? Let the adversaries of this portion of Jehovah’s deep and eternal counsel now put matters to the proof: let them exhaust the power of their inventive faculty and see, whether or not they can devise a rescue.

This glorious concluding clause of the passage now handled, to wit, that through Christ, even souls non-elect, were the indispensable conditions of God fulfilled, **MIGHT HAVE LIFE**, I regard with peculiar complacency. The reason is, that in plain outspoken phrase—even so many distinct words—it asserts that Jehovah has eyes to see, wisdom and justice to exalt, that which our ultra-Calvinistic theologians can neither by force of their own reason discern, nor yet upon the authority of the unerring Word place to the Lord’s credit; to wit, that there is in the grand Work of Christ such infinite glory and strength, as causes it not only in time to be decreed an all-sufficient ground for the progress of Jehovah’s evangelical purpose in the non-elect, but by the awfully sad case of those very parties, the more abundantly to redound to the divine praise throughout eternity. Ultra-Calvinists, however, reject the whole counsel of God in the case of the non-elect, because *as they very plainly give us to understand, they forsooth,*

can neither see *for* it a satisfactory ground, nor *in* it an unimpeachable justice. But, notwithstanding this too palpable infirmity which *they* plead, notwithstanding also that rationalistic and wrong conclusion which very unscripturally *they* found upon it, it is to me, and must certainly to every other God-exalting, Bible-loving, truth-magnifying mind be a peculiar satisfaction to mark, that in this last clause of the passage which I have cited the Son of God makes manifest, that He has an eye to see deeper than these very short-sighted men : and seeing a million-fold deeper, records for general information the fact,—*That HE DETECTS in Himself both AN AMPLE AND AN INFINITELY GLORIOUS GROUND, on which in honour and strict righteousness, the Father CAN LAY A PROFFER OF LIFE BEFORE THE NON-ELECT.*

Of such non-elect souls, then, be it remembered, that the co-equal, coessential Son of God, not with a debasing lie on His lip, but without detriment to the unsullied glory of His immaculate holiness has said, that the folly, the wickedness, the great vice of their nature and will is abundantly demonstrated by the fact, **THAT THEY WILL NOT COME TO HIM, THAT THEY MIGHT HAVE LIFE.** Words, be sure, of which when the great and fearful day is fully come it will be proved, that truth more awfully solemn, more tremendously condemnatory than that contained in them, never before nor since proceeded forth—never again it may be will in righteousness issue—from the mouth divine.

But I have not yet completed the use which I intend to make of this God-justifying passage—this adamant bulwark against the antisciptural conclusions of the antagonists of Christ's infinite sufficiency. That controversy, which in full view of the rapidly approaching hour of judgment I conduct against all rationalistic, all self-constituted judges, is far too weighty to be dismissed with omissions. It is absolutely indispensable, since on the one hand, I have clearly shewn the dread issues of the Son of God's holy speech ; that on the other, I should with equal plainness make known the hideous contradictions thereof, which are in the unhallowed dogma under consideration substantially involved. This then I affirm, that to the whole of the above awfully momentous condemnation at the lips of the Son of God—yea ! to clause after clause most emphatically—does that evil dogma boldly impute guile ; in plain unvarnished phrase, **GIVE THE LIE.** Follow then every Christian, every ingenuous mind, while in the full uncomeliness of its Christ-dishonouring imputations, I make this doctrinal fraud manifest before all heaven and the sun.

FIRST, in the person of the Incarnate Word, thus saith *Jehovah*,—"The truth, ye men of Judah, as submitted to your

hearts and consciences in my Word, even the pure truth of the gospel, ye have not through your carnal contempt abiding in you." It is manifest, that this is a divine charge brought against these parties, and that its spirit is in the highest degree condemnatory; the condemnation being not for disregard of that which *was not* thrust upon them, but for that which perseveringly *was*. But thus saith the highly irreverent dogma which I condemn,—“This assertion of Jehovah is mere falsehood: for Christ having in no sense whatever died for the non-elect—that is, *with intention to make way for an evangelical purpose towards them*—there is absolutely no sufficiency in Him, that He should be a righteous ground on which to submit to those parties a gospel proffer; consequently, there never in reality was, never moreover in truth and equity could have been, a gospel preached to them.”

SECONDLY, thus saith Jehovah,—“Herein, ye Jews, is your carnal contempt practically demonstrated, in that He whom I have sent, Him ye believe not.” The august Being here spoken of is the second Divine Person in the all-glorious Trinity, the Eternal Word; and the reason, as by Himself shewn, of his being commissioned and sent to these non-elect Jews, is in verse 34 of the context thus explained: “*But THESE THINGS I say (that is, preach into your ears) THAT YE MIGHT BE SAVED.*” But, specially, what things that they might be saved? I again apply to the *immediate context* at verse 24, and find it written as follows: “Verily, verily, I say unto you, *He that heareth my word, AND BELIEVETH ON HIM THAT SENT ME hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life.*”

B^E these two contexts, the Lord Jesus has in the very clearest manner unfolded what is meant by the complaint, “Whom he hath sent, him YE BELIEVE NOT.” Thus much, Jehovah. But what saith the unhallowed dogma of those who deny God’s purpose in the non-elect? This. “The statement of Jehovah in both instances is utterly false: for there being absolutely no sufficiency in the Eternal Son as a righteous ground on which in the case of the non-elect to bestow life, or save, there can by no possibility be charged upon these parties the crime of evangelical unbelief, that is, unbelief in Christ. Nay! saith the dogma, the case being so, the steadfast disbelief of the non-elect in the gospel as a proffer of life to them—in Christ Jesus as a Saviour sufficient for them—in the absence of malice and presence of goodwill in the Father toward them—is in reality a glory and a virtue: because a practical correction, and virtual condemnation of the specious but radically false statements, which without a shadow of equitable or righteous ground have by the Spirit of God through the lips of Christ been submitted. While anything short on the part

of the non-elect of this attitude of determined unbelief, would necessarily have been to abet the Deity in falsehood, and debase themselves by known pandering to a lie." THIRDLY, thus saith Jehovah : "Search the Scriptures ; for in them ye think ye have eternal life." The careful examination of the Word, and reconsideration which are here counselled, are necessarily (unless the Saviour's advice is to be held a mere act of madness) counselled for an end : that end, the correction of erroneous Jewish interpretation. But the correction of error is manifestly for the benevolent end of bringing the mind off from wrong conclusions to right. The command therefore, "Search the Scriptures," is Christ's benevolent assay to correct the misinterpretations by which these non-elect parties were evidently hardened in their rejection of Himself ; to the high end, that their error being dissipated, the weighty influence of gospel truth might be brought to operate *against* their disastrous unbelief. But thus saith the highly indecorous dogma which I explode : "The counsel in this instance vouchsafed by Christ was not sincere—the end ostensibly aimed at unreal : for there being no sufficiency in Him as a ground upon which to send forth to the non-elect a message of life, it was worse than waste of labour on His part to attempt anything against the unbelief of those parties ; for since in reality He had no gospel message to deliver to them, the attempt to remove their unbelief in that fact, was in effect an insidious attempt to instigate them to the belief of falsehood." FOURTHLY, thus saith the Lord : "Search the Scriptures, that your error being corrected ye may know, that they are they which in the matter of eternal life testify of me." But what, be it asked, was the infallible tendency of thus establishing the grand fact that eternal life is in Christ? Was it not, that by the whole weight of the moral influence which belongs to truth, that fact might powerfully operate to draw the mind and heart off from every false hope ; to the end that in this grand matter of escape from death, the soul might be brought to look to Christ—and to Christ alone? But thus saith the utterly reprehensible dogma which I explode : "The intention of Christ in this evangelical instruction was, and must necessarily have been, only to deceive and entangle. For granting that the whole mighty tendency of vital truth is to withdraw the mind from error and fix it upon a solid foundation, yet in this case, since there was absolutely no sufficiency in Christ to bestow upon the non-elect life, no real testimony throughout the Scriptures to any such adequacy, the whole weighty tendency of this ostensibly zealous teaching of Christ was, merely to withdraw the souls of his hearers from one delusion, that they might become fixed upon a worse : in short, to make their last state more

blinding, more ensnaring than the first: for whereas in their former error they were backed but by the ignorance of their own mind, in this latter, should they adopt it, it would be by all the authority of Jehovah." FIFTHLY, thus saith the Lord: "And ye, through your inveterate love of sin, and the consequent determination of your will for sin's indulgence, will not come to me." This passage, considered in immediate connexion with all that has gone before, evidently conveys the very strongest censure. But, censure for what, I demand? The answer as elicited from the unerring page of Scripture is, their cold contempt, through inveterate love of sin, of God's goodwill as expressed in the free proffer of life; and their causeless hatred of the Divine Persons—to wit, the Son and the Father—by whom the truth of that proffer was promulgated. But thus saith the highly contumacious dogma condemned: "The censure here expressed by the Lord Jesus Christ is not just, does not in any righteous sense apply to the parties in question. For since there is no shadow of sufficiency in Him or His Work on which to found a proffer of life, these non-elect parties, in that act of their will by which they refused to come to Him, were abundantly justified. Moreover, since in this boasted proffer of life there was no reality whatever, but a mere endeavour to entrap and land in an error even greater than the first, their hatred, however intense and deep that might have been, was not causeless, but with cause more than sufficient." LASTLY, thus saith Jehovah: "In your refusing to come to me, your folly and madness is made manifest by the fact, that, if ye would have come, YE MIGHT HAVE HAD ETERNAL LIFE." The conjunction, *that*, in this sentence, it must perforce be admitted, couples the effect which is afterward predicated, with its producing cause as described immediately before. If therefore through lack of virtue in His grand sacrifice the Saviour had had no power to bestow on these non-elect parties life, then, in honour, in truth, and in equity, he was bound to limit his remark to the first clause of the verse, and abstain altogether from the second. Had Christ done this, I freely admit that the passage would not have been a plain outspoken assertion—a declaration in set terms—of that august truth which for the glory of His name and sacrifice I defend. In that case, this noble truth would only have been implied. But He does not bound His condemnation of these non-elect parties by their personal aversion and refusal to come to Him: nay! but He connects that aversion and that refusal to come, with *an ability in Himself* to grant eternal life: and by express use of the conjunction "*that*," he explains the non-reception of the gift of eternal life here mentioned

to be an effect, of the said aversion and refusal to come to Him, which is its producing cause: "*Ye will not come to me, THAT, ye might have eternal life.*" The unerring Deity therefore in set terms—picked phrase—chosen language—asserts that through the work which He accomplished on the cross, HE SEES in Himself the most ample, most perfect sufficiency, to form a righteous ground on which *even in the case of the non-elect* Jehovah may justly bestow life. But thus saith the Christ-insulting dogma which I here make over to Satan: "This explicit, this most emphatic declaration of the Eternal Son, is but barefaced misrepresentation: for the death of the Incarnate Deity, having in no sense whatever been incurred for the non-elect—that is, under evangelical design in connection with them—but being solely and exclusively for the elect, there is no such sufficiency in Immanuel and His Work as that which by a falsehood He here claims; hence, it follows, that in any righteous, any equitable sense considered, there is absolutely no shadow of possibility, that upon the parties whom He here so expressly censures Jehovah the Son should be able to bestow—LIFE."

Such the opprobrious contradictions, such the unspeakably injurious imputations, which are by the rationalistic dogma under consideration thrust into the very bosom of God. Had they not by the faithful pen which I here hold in my right hand been set in the light, it would with every Scripture-revering mind have been a pure impossibility to believe, that sentiments involving conclusions so unutterably repulsive, should be found to constitute the actual glorying of men not merely professing to follow the Saviour and the walk which is according to godliness, but actually adopting as their distinctive badge—badge by assumption of which they systematically exalt themselves above others—that most imposing of titles, to wit, "MEN OF TRUTH."

But in face of the foregoing demonstrations it may now possibly by way of apology be urged,—“True, the passage from the lips of the Son of God here adduced must be granted to be awfully solemn and decisive; but does it not stand alone—altogether insulated and unsupported? and are there not on the opposite side of the question many equally solemn texts which may be brought against it—texts which seem to justify our rejection of the doctrine of competency in Jehovah on the strength of the WORK OF CHRIST to give eternal life to the non-elect? To this Scripture-dishonouring, this strange and very futile inquiry, I most positively reply, That throughout the entire range of the Bible there are to be found no passages—nay, not a solitary one—that can be brought against that all-sufficiency

in Christ to grant life to *the non-elect*, which in censuring certain of these very parties for not coming to Him, is here by the lips of the Son of God so emphatically asserted. And that this fact may for the glory of God be placed upon a permanent basis, I publicly invite the ultra-Calvinistic theologians of the whole world to make manifest such passages,—promising to their expositions the most unprejudiced and careful consideration. Were it possible to produce one such, all the wisdom, all the stipulations, and all the acts of the Father and the Son in that Covenant which bears exclusively upon the non-elect, would infallibly throughout eternity stand impeached. What such theologians (very unwisely consulting with natural reason) have *conceived* to be passages opposed to the idea of Christ's all-sufficiency, ARE THOSE WHICH BELONG EXCLUSIVELY TO THE COVENANT OF GRACE. Hence, as a matter of course, they bear entirely on mercies and blessings in connexion with the elect; and referring to these alone, they speak as might be expected, in a sense both discriminating and absolute: that is, in a way to exclude the idea that parties *not* elected have in anywise to do with them. For after all that can be said on the reverse side of the question, it abides a truth—truth which it boots nothing to deny—that the things of the Covenant of Grace *do not*, yea! *cannot* belong to the general body of the non-elect. Nevertheless, the fact that on the strength of the grand Work of Christ there has been devised and set up a Covenant of Grace—that is, a Covenant guaranteeing the Lord Jesus Christ in eternal possession of the elect—can, as in chapter fourth I have been at pains to demonstrate, neither annihilate the other Covenant which has upon the very same Work been established; nor destroy that divine and infinite virtue inseparable from the Son's sacrifice, which having by the deeply scrutinizing wisdom of Jehovah been detected as all-sufficient, has enabled Him publicly, in presence of the whole intellectual creation, to ordain it the sole foundation on which to conduct His evangelical purpose in the non-elect.

As a last duty, however, in connexion with this particular head of the controversy, I proceed to prove, that for any one to whose antisciptural conceptions the foregoing passage proves fatal, to cheer himself in his dilemma with the idea that this passage stands solitary—exists as a text insulated, unsupported, and alone—is in reality to betray the greatest ignorance of Scripture. So far from that, not only are there many equally emphatic passages to the same end, but over and above, minor testimonies innumerable. For lack of space, however, I shall here be able to exhibit only a few of the most remarkable.

Example I. “And He (Jesus) said unto them, Ye are from
15

beneath ; I am from above : ye are of this world ; I am not of this world. I said therefore unto you, that ye shall die in your sins : for IF ye BELIEVE NOT that I am he (*Messiah, the promised Redeemer*) YE SHALL DIE IN YOUR SINS." (Jo. viii. 23, 24.) In this scripture, exactly as in the foregoing, we have the grand truth which in this chapter I defend, incontrovertibly established. The several parts of the passage are as follows : first, a freely preached gospel, and divine warrant to the non-elect to believe in Christ : secondly, a conditional doom (its conditional character strongly marked by employment of the hypothetical particle IF), that conditional doom being, to death under unpardoned sin in the event of these non-elect souls *not* believing on Christ : thirdly, a power or all-sufficiency in Christ, on his own established conditions to extend to these very parties remission of sin : fourthly, the implied fact, that the indispensable conditions being fulfilled, Christ would not prove false—would certainly be justified in His words—would not suffer those to whom He spoke to die unpardoned : and fifthly, that the four preceding truths pre-suppose a fifth, to wit, the existence of a just or honourable ground for the progress of this evangelical dealing with the non-elect ; seeing that by nature these parties are under the law, and for their breach of that law, by its sanction most justly condemned. With reference therefore to the last of these five facts in particular, if it be true that the honourable ground here spoken of *does* actually exist, then, would those ultra-Calvinistic theologians, who, regardless of Scripture, take upon them to deny the grand WORK OF CHRIST to be that ground, vouchsafe in much courtesy to shew, on what other ground apart from that WORK, a God of law, of justice, and of judgment, can give effect to such things ?

Example II. Then Jesus said unto them, Yet a little while is the light (CHRIST) with you. Walk while ye have the light, lest darkness come upon you : for he that walketh in darkness knoweth not whither he goeth. *While ye have light, BELIEVE IN THE LIGHT, THAT YE MAY BE THE CHILDREN OF LIGHT.*" (Jo. xii. 35, 36.) Here in figurative language are once more set before us the several facts so plainly witnessed in the foregoing example. The only difference between the two passages being, that whereas in the former these facts were conveyed negatively and in the way of warning, in the present they are conveyed affirmatively and by the way of promise. For here is, first, a freely preached gospel, and a true warrant to the non-elect to believe on Christ : secondly, a conditional promise (strongly marked by the conjunction THAT) ; which conditional promise is, that believing on Him they shall be the children of light : thirdly, a power or all-sufficiency in Christ, upon His own established conditions to

effect what His words indicate: fourthly, the implied fact, that the equitable conditions being fulfilled, He would infallibly be true—would be justified in His words: and fifthly, all this proceeding upon a strictly righteous ground, the only righteous ground of the grand WORK OF CHRIST.

Example III. "And if any man hear my (Christ's) words, and BELIEVE NOT, I judge him not: for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world. *He that REJECTETH ME, and receiveth not MY WORDS, hath one that judgeth him: THE WORD that I have spoken, THE SAME shall judge him in the last day.*" (Jo. xii. 48, 49.) In this altogether decisive passage is found, first, a freely preached gospel to the non-elect, and divine warrant to those parties to believe it: secondly, unqualified censure for unbelief, and a special declaration in connexion with that dispositional state, to wit, of judgment to follow: thirdly, explicit certification of the fact, that unbelief of the gospel is THE PRACTICAL REJECTION OF THE SON OF GOD, that is, in the character of a proffered Saviour; of which act, the gospel itself has been appointed the instrument of condemnation, or, one that judgeth the despiser: and fourthly, because of this appointment of the gospel as the instrument of condemnation, the awful assurance, that that gospel word (called elsewhere a sweet savour of Christ unto God in them that perish), shall as a divine and unanswerable witness against these parties, rise up in the judgment of the last day. But if all these things be realities—realities in connexion with souls by nature under the law, and for breach of the statute legally and justly condemned, upon what righteous ground (let it be shewn) save the grand WORK OF CHRIST, can a God of law, of justice, and of judgment, do such things?

Example IV. "And the next sabbath day came almost the whole city together to hear the word (that is, gospel word) of God. But when the Jews saw the multitudes they were filled with envy, and spoke against those things which were spoken by Paul, contradicting and blaspheming. Then Paul and Barnabas waxed bold and said, It was necessary that the word of God should *first have been spoken to you: but seeing YE PUT IT FROM YOU, and judge yourselves unworthy OF EVERLASTING LIFE*, lo, we turn to the Gentiles." (Acts xiii. 45-47.) In this inspired and infallible declaration, we once more have, first, the indiscriminate preaching of the gospel to the non-elect, and the Lord's free warrant to them to believe on Christ: secondly, positive declaration that with Jehovah there was an absolute necessity, that that gospel should not only be preached to such non-elect parties, but first of all to the very bitterest among them, the Judaic persecutors and blasphemers: thirdly, that the unbelief of that gospel by these

sin-infatuated persons was not merely in the sight of God displeasing, but was by Him considered equal to a public judgment brought forth by their own hearts against themselves, to wit, that they were to the uttermost unworthy of that everlasting life which had in His great name been freely tendered. But if all this be true, then, since these non-elect persecutors were by nature under the law, and for breach of the statute already by that law condemned, upon what righteous ground (let it be shewn) apart from the grand WORK OF CHRIST, can a God of law, of justice, and of judgment, conduct such dealings?

Example V. "And when Silas and Timotheus were come from Macedonia, Paul was *pressed in the spirit* (that is, by special power of the Holy Ghost) and testified to the Jews that Jesus was Christ. But when they opposed themselves and blasphemed, he shook his raiment, and said unto them, *Your blood (that is, ye scornors of the free proffer of life through Christ)* BE UPON YOUR OWN HEADS; I AM CLEAN: from henceforth I will go to the Gentiles." (Acts xviii. 5, 6.) Here once more to the bitterest of the persecutors of the way of God, is first, a free gospel set forth, together with the divine warrant to believe: secondly, the act of Paul in thus emphatically preaching Christ to bitter persecutors, declared to be the result not of ordinary, but altogether extraordinary influence of the Holy Ghost: thirdly, manifestations the most public and unmistakable of the disapprobation of God because of the unbelief of these non-elect Jews: and fourthly, an awfully impressive action by the inspired Agent testifying the divine displeasure, to wit, the shaking in presence of the whole assembly of his raiment, and declaring, that by this malicious rejection of that only deliverance from the condemnation of the law which is given under heaven among men, these non-elect persecutors had thoroughly judged in their own case, and at unawares accomplished Jehovah's design: to wit, proved that their everlasting destruction, or in the words of the Apostle himself, "their blood," that is, damnation of flesh and spirit, was chargeable exclusively upon the obduracy of their OWN WILL.

But what, be it enquired, would God signify by that deeply impressive act of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, when through special and overwhelming influence of the Holy Spirit, He constrained him publicly to shake his raiment, and with deep earnestness subjoin the emphatic declaration, "I AM CLEAN—I AM CLEAN." These words, it is evident, were not spoken in any low and captious sense—by which is meant, were not used by Paul with a view merely to assert his own faithfulness and integrity as a preacher of the gospel: nay! but strictly in his high official character as an ambassador of heaven—the representative to men

and angels of the Living God ; that God, who for the clearing of His nature from all shadow of suspicion, His election from chargeability with the eternal ruin of His enemies, had upon the page of inspiration graven oath, "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked ; but that the wicked turn from his way and live." By that action then of His representative, His accredited ambassador, the significance of which I am engaged in unfolding, did Jehovah through the Eternal Spirit in Paul, actually shake clear in presence of the whole intelligent creation that robe of unapproachable light in which as in a garment He stands swathed, and make manifest to every angel and archangel of the armies of heaven, that in the everlasting, the irrevocable damnation of these corrupt men, He (that is, the glorious attribute of His benevolence) stood perfectly or to the very uttermost clear ; for that neither malice in the Divine Nature, nor any fatality in His sovereign election, was the true root of this ruin ; but the love of sin—personal choice of evil and hate of righteousness alone.

Example VI. "But there were false prophets also among the people, even as there shall be false teachers among you, who privily shall bring in damnable heresies, *even denying the Lord THAT BOUGHT THEM, and bring upon themselves swift destruction.*" (2 Pet. ii. 1.) If this denial by mouth of the parties here spoken of was, as it evidently must have been, the result of previous heart rejection of Christ through *unbelief*, then, this passage sets forth the very same facts as all those which have preceded it. I stay not therefore to recapitulate, but proceed forthwith to call attention to the Apostle's exceedingly explicit declaration of the fact, that although non-elect, yet in a very peculiar, very sufficient sense, *Christ had by some means actually bought* these parties : and that as a consequence, their conduct must inevitably bring upon them that augmented measure of righteous retribution, which is explained by the inspired expressions "death unto death," and "the greater damnation."

If the divine goodness here predicated is to be exalted, it is for the instruction and guidance of the reader necessary, that with reference to the exact meaning of the passage, "*the Lord that bought them,*" I submit a brief word of explanation. . When then it is by the Apostle said, that those false teachers against whom he was bent on warning the Churches should deny and persecute the glorious Son of God that *bought them*, and so bring upon themselves an augmented condemnation, the words "*bought them*" neither can, nor may be understood in the same absolute and unqualified sense in which Christ is said to have purchased *Himself an inheritance* in the elect—and bought with His precious

blood the Church. The difference between the two cases I have distinctly set forth in treating the respective Covenants of the Lord Jesus Christ. By the one, the Covenant of Grace, it is irreversibly stipulated, that in defiance of everything which would oppose, the Son *shall* possess His purchased inheritance. Hence, although in their primitive or natural estate, the parties comprehended under this Covenant hate and reject Christ, with an inveteracy of malice as great, and in some instances even greater than that which marks many of the non-elect, yet it is stipulated, that through grace of the Holy Spirit that enmity shall be graciously subdued, and their souls through faith firmly knit to their Lord for salvation. By virtue then of this irrevocably decreed consummation, it is evident, that in a sense the most ultra and absolute—in short, with intent to have and to hold for ever—the Lord Jesus Christ has purchased with His blood the Church. That Church, therefore, is His actual inheritance: an inheritance which is positively inalienable. It is His by the gift of the Father; His by absolute purchase; and His by spiritual regeneration: of which gifted, purchased, regenerated possession, the least, the weakest member, can never be plucked out of His hand. But by the other Covenant, the Covenant of Equity, it is *not* expressly stipulated that in defiance of all that would oppose the Son shall have those under it for a spiritual seed: is *not* stipulated that notwithstanding the hatred of those under it they shall by the grace of the Holy Spirit be subdued, and their souls through faith united to Christ for salvation. What then? Simply this, that on the all-sufficient ground of the grand law-magnifying WORK OF CHRIST, a proffer of life under the equitable conditions of repentance and faith be set before them. In what particular sense then may it be said, that the Son of God has bought them? I answer very plainly in this. First, that despite the original condemnation of the law for sin, which condemnation was to summary or immediate damnation, Christ has bought each and all of these unto a season of respite, during which he endows them with innumerable temporal blessings and privileges. And secondly, that despite the original condemnation of the law which was unto summary or immediate damnation, He has bought them unto a free proffer upon equitable conditions of eternal life. And thirdly, that despite the original condemnation of the law which was to summary or immediate damnation, He has bought them unto the high immunity of the moral influence in His Word, His ordinances, and His militant church: the enjoyment, in short, of *all* that which (*without indeed having power despotically to overrule and constrain*) is nevertheless of the very highest possible adaptation to instruct, to warn, to influence, and to incline in the

direction of true wisdom ; in plain phrase, instigate to repentance and salvation. But by reason of a deeply-seated love of sin, hatred of soul to the Holy Persons of the Father and the Son, subordination under the affections and flesh of the will, these non-elect parties still steadfastly reject those most equitable conditions, which, in order to a right reception of the gift of life, have by Wisdom Divine been deemed absolutely indispensable : hence finally and everlastingly perish. It cannot therefore with respect to these, in anything like the same lofty, ultra, absolute sense be said, that Christ has with His most precious blood purchased or bought. Nay. But in a sense the most literal and important—*important because of that practical demonstration which for the clearing of Jehovah's nature and election has through means of this purchase been determined*—it certainly may be affirmed, that unto that respite from the summary damnation of hell, and all else which in the foregoing passages I have carefully enumerated, He certainly and actually *has* bought them.

Example VII. "This is a faithful saying and worthy of all acceptation. For therefore we both labour and suffer reproach, because we trust in the living God, who is *the Saviour OF ALL MEN, specially of THOSE THAT BELIEVE.*" (1 Tim. iv. 9, 10.) If in connexion with this passage it be only remembered, that the Saviour here spoken of saves the souls of men through the preaching of faith, or the gospel, then, in this inspired assertion also we have the entire substance of all that is contained in the several passages which have gone before. Not, however, to dwell upon *that*, which even "ad nauseam" I have proved and established, let the reader permit me to impress upon his mind the decisive fact, that *the very same distinction* which in the immediately foregoing Example I have made upon the special clause "*Lord that bought them,*" the Apostle Paul, in the passage before us, is himself careful to make upon the term *Saviour*. The Lord Jesus Christ cannot in the same ultra or absolute sense in which He is said to be the Saviour of the elect, be said to be the Saviour of the non-elect : for the elect, despite their natural hatred and rejection of Himself, He, through grace of the Holy Spirit, subdues, sanctifies, and saves. Were the non-elect also by the spiritual power of Christ regenerated and overruled, it is clear, that notwithstanding nature's original enmity and contempt, no individual of the race of Adam would be lost. But that salvation, which by a far loftier stretch of sovereign prerogative is through gracious constraint of the all-quickenings Spirit, is only under the Covenant of Grace ; consequently, extends not to those under the Covenant of Equity. So then, since under this Covenant the Son of God *does not* by the sovereign, effectual grace of the Holy

Spirit quicken, subdue, and save ; but is a Saviour simply by that free proffer of life which on the strictly equitable conditions of repentance and faith He through his sacrifice is entitled to set before men ; therefore, it is clear, that in the same exalted and glorious sense in which he is the Saviour of the elect, He *cannot*, yea ! *may not*, be predicated to be the Saviour of the non-elect. And yet in a sense the most weighty and God-magnifying—*God-magnifying because of that practical demonstration, which for clearing the divine nature and election has through means of his saviourship been determined*—He most certainly is their Saviour. Hence the apostle Paul, through that unerring light by the Eternal Spirit vouchsafed him, makes manifest the broad distinction which exists, between Christ as an all-sufficient ground for the progress of Jehovah's evangelical purpose in the non-elect ; and Christ as an accepted sacrifice for the free vouchsafement of Jehovah's saving grace to the elect ; saying, to the end that he may in a manner the most emphatic mark that distinction,—“ *The Lord Jesus Christ is, unquestionably, (that is, in the sense which I have indicated), THE SAVIOUR OF ALL MEN ; but by reason of the sovereign effectual grace of His Spirit working in favoured individuals, is in a sense the most ultra and absolute, THE SAVIOUR OF THE ELECT.*”

Example VIII. “ If we receive the witness of men, the *witness of God is greater* : for this is the witness of God which he hath testified of his Son. He that believeth on the Son of God hath the witness in himself : *he that BELIEVETH NOT GOD hath made him A LIAR ; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son. And this is the record, THAT GOD HATH GIVEN TO US ETERNAL LIFE, and this life is in his Son.* (1 Jo. v, 9—11.) Not to dwell upon the fact, that this most remarkable passage contains the entire substance of all the foregoing, I proceed at once to point out, that it presents us with some additional matter by which even more triumphantly, more decisively still to establish the grand truth of the Saviour's competency, through His death, to extend the gift of life to the non-elect.

Observe then, O reader, that the beloved Apostle is here through inspiration laying down what he calls the witness of God : a witness which, by reason of its being divine, hence infinitely greater than that of man, is worthy in the very highest to be believed in and trusted. That witness is, the truth which He has testified of His Son. And the testimony or record of the Father to which reference is expressly made, John takes occasion to explain as follows, viz., “ *This is the record, that God hath given to us (that is, set before us) eternal life, and this life is in His Son.*” Such the witness, testimony, or record of the Father in connexion

with His Son. Now saith the Apostle, because this is Jehovah's record, he that according to that record believeth on the Son (that is, for life) receiveth and hath the witness (that is, of the Spirit bearing witness with his spirit) in himself. But he that in contempt of the very same record *believeth not God*, hath practically made God (that is, treated God as if He were) a liar. Because he hath *not believed the express record* which God gave of His Son. I call the reader to note, that nothing could be more simple, more explicit, more unequivocal, than this declaration through the pen of that most spiritually minded of the apostles, John. In full view of it, therefore, do I to the common sense of all those who take upon them to deny the grand Work of Christ to be an all-sufficient ground for Jehovah's evangelical purpose in the non-elect, take upon me to submit the five following distinct questions. It will certainly very greatly tend to remove antiscriptural absurdity from their interpretations and theories, if they may find scope to answer.

1. If, as on the sole warrant of their natural reason these theologians assert, it were indeed true, that there is no actual, no positive ability in the Son of God, through His Work to extend on the equitable conditions chosen the gift of life to the non-elect, then, when the Holy Spirit by the pen of John here says, "the record or witness of God is, that He hath given, that is, set before us eternal life, and this life is in His Son;" of which record or witness the consequence is, that the non-elect in not believing it are chargeable with the crime of making God a liar; might it not with unanswerable pertinence be asked, Since in spite of this bold but false statement of the Holy Ghost by the pen of John, there is no ability whatever in the Son of God to extend the gift of life to the non-elect, consequently no such thing *in reality* as the setting by God of a free proffer of life before them, therefore, how is it at all possible, *supposing always that these parties adhere to fact and truth*, that they could do otherwise than refuse to believe and make God a liar? Or do my opponents indeed say, that the non-elect are to believe a lie, because Jehovah bids it? Such my first question: let the judges of Jehovah answer.

2. If, as on the sole warrant of their natural reason these theologians assert, it were indeed true, that in spite of this bold but false statement of the Holy Ghost by the pen of John, there is no ability whatever in the Son of God, through His Work to extend on the equitable conditions chosen the gift of life to the non-elect, then, in these non-elect honourably adhering to fact and truth, and sternly refusing to believe the manifestly false witness or record set forth by the Spirit of God, wherein I demand their fault? *In presence of, heaven, the earth, and hell, I profess*

myself inadequate to detect any. For if a record, no matter whose, be absolutely and palpably false, then, unquestionably, according to the strictest principle of eternal equity, the just, the befitting meed of such mendacious and base record is, not only that it receive no honour by the way of belief, but that by every upright and honourable mind it be to the uttermost despised and detested. And if according to the most stringent principle of equity this be its altogether befitting meed, then, in the highly justifiable act of these non-elect parties, that is, their righteous rejection of it with the contempt which it deserves, wherein their fault? Is a lie made venerable because it comes down from heaven? But if there be no fault, where then a shadow of ground, or at least just ground, upon which to impute to these non-believing parties guilt? And if no shadow of ground upon which the Lord can impute guilt, then where, I say not the righteousness, but the common decency of condemning with an evangelical condemnation, and visiting with an augmented damnation? Such my second question: again let the judges of Jehovah answer.

3. If, as on the sole warrant of their natural reason these theologians assert, it were indeed true, that in spite of this bold but false statement of the Spirit of God by the pen of John, there is no ability whatever in the Lord Jesus, through His Work to extend on the equitable conditions named the gift of life to the non-elect, then, nothing can be more self-evident than the fact, that the Eternal Father who in Scripture is ever represented as the root of the great scheme of redemption, must to the very uttermost have been conscious of this dilemma—this non-sufficiency of virtue in His Son. But if in defiance of the knowledge of which He must necessarily have stood possessed, to wit, that there was *no* real competency in the Eternal Son by virtue of His Work to extend the gift of life to the non-elect, it has by the Eternal Father through his Holy Spirit in the apostle John been positively but altogether falsely asserted that there *is*, then, is it not a hideous and an absolute fact, that this second assertion, viz., that the unbelief of the non-elect *makes God a liar*, is but the adding of a *further falsehood* to the falsehood which went before? For under these circumstances are not the actual facts of the case these, that not the unavoidable act of the non-elect in not believing, but His own deliberately promulgated false record *alone* is that which makes God to be a liar; while the steadfast refusal of the parties in question to believe such false record, has for its very simple effect to set things naked and manifest in the *light*: thus practically unto the whole of God's intelligent creation *demonstrating*, that the unbelieving are not merely in equity

justified in their act, but that their extra damnation because of that necessary act is *not* just. Such my third question : let the judges of Jehovah answer.

4. If, as on the exclusive warrant of their natural reason these theologians assert, it were indeed true, that in spite of this bold but false statement of the Holy Spirit by the pen of John, there is no ability in the Son of God through His Work to extend on the equitable conditions chosen the gift of life to the non-elect, then, forasmuch as in no sense whatever the Lord Jesus Christ is a Saviour for these parties, His sacrifice in no sense whatever, not even under fulfilment of the equitable conditions proposed the just ground of a proffer of life to them, the fact stands firm and immovable for ever, that in the true evangelical sense (*sense of rejecting Christ and despising a proffer of life in him*), it is the purest of all pure impossibilities that such non-elect parties should be capable of the sin of unbelief. For if it be true that in no sense whatever Christ is a Saviour for *them*—His sacrifice in no sense whatever the just ground of a promise of life to *them*—His gospel in no sense whatever glad tidings, its call to repentance and faith in no sense whatever a summons or call to *them*—then, since there is *nothing* in the shape of a Saviour, *nothing* in the shape of a promise of life, *nothing* in the shape of glad tidings, *nothing* in the shape of a gospel call to repentance and faith laid before them, it is self-evident that upon these several NON-ENTITIES there can be no discoverable foundation for unbelief. Because a series of absolute *nothings* can by no possibility, nay! not the logic of ultra-Calvinism itself, be shown to amount to *something* ; and without a positive something, that is, an entity of some kind to form a ground of unbelief, there must to all eternity remain no ground. And if no ground, then, it must be the purest of all pure impossibilities in this total absence of *evangelical* ground, to set up a charge of Christ-rejection by the way of *evangelical* unbelief. The fact therefore being now established, that as far as the non-elect are concerned it is altogether and utterly impossible that they should be guilty of evangelical unbelief, and since as far as the elect are implicated the grace of the Holy Spirit is provided to remove such evangelical unbelief, Why, (for this is my question), why does the infinitely wise Jehovah throughout the whole length and breadth of Scripture, incessantly busy Himself not only to disapprove that false mental state, but everlastingly condemn for its criminality? Whose, be it inquired, the evangelical unbelief thus condemned? For if through the power of divine grace the elect are delivered from their unbelief, and if through their utter exclusion from connexion with the gospel the non-elect are absolutely incapable of it,

then, since there shall at last be no solitary individual of the race of Adam found in this guilt, upon whom in the judgment of the great and fearful day, shall be fulfilled those terrible threatenings which stand arrayed against it? Does Jehovah trifle in his denunciations? Does He sport with the solemnity of judgment? Or does He, as by ultra-Calvinistic theologians virtually asserted, debase Himself with a lie, that He may obtain the fell satisfaction of gratuitously augmenting to the non-elect damnation? Such my fourth question: let the judges of Jehovah answer.

5. If, as on the sole warrant of their natural reason these theologians assert, it were indeed true, that in spite of this bold but false statement of the glorious third Person of the Trinity by the pen of John, there is no ability whatever in the Son of God through His Work to extend on the equitable conditions chosen the gift of life to the non-elect; then, since regardless of this fact of Christ's *non-sufficiency* to bestow life, not in this passage only, but every other throughout the Bible calling the non-elect to repentance and faith—censuring moreover for unbelief—it is manifestly implied that there is in the Lord Jesus a positive *all-sufficiency* to that gift; might it not in full view of a record thus flagrantly mendacious most pertinently be demanded, Wherein under these circumstances is the witness of God (albeit divine) in a moral point of view a whit greater than the witness of men? And upon what prevarication, shift, subterfuge, may such witness escape the charge of being base, low, little, deceptive, mendacious, disgraceful; ay! rank as the vilest that ever issued from the purlieus of Mecca—the dens of the Jesuits—or that vulcanage of Satanic weapon and false thunder, the Vatican! Does God, I submit, ever assert, that even *His* great and glorious name is of virtue to sanctify false witness? Such my *fifth* question: let the judges of Jehovah then answer.

I need pursue the momentous theme no further. As far as the truth of adequacy in the grand Work of Christ is concerned—(*Work to the glorious heights and depths of which the infiniteness of Eternal Wisdom alone is at all equal to extend*)—its adequacy **EVEN IN THE CASE OF SOULS NON-ELECT** to constitute a righteous ground upon which Jehovah may confer life—I have here, I affirm, set it up as on a mountain of light. Who is he that by the Scriptures shall be able to pluck it down? On the strength therefore of an altogether infinite glory inseverable from the Work of Christ, by virtue of which that Work has been decreed an honourable ground on which to conduct *the whole evangelical* purpose of God—that is, His purpose in the elect and also in the non-elect—be it once for all most emphatically laid

down, that when for objects of paramount importance in a coming eternity the divine wisdom apprehended it as an absolute necessity, that to wrong doers both of the elect and non-elect repentance and faith should through the Work of Christ be freely preached, then, in that step which with a view to secure the accomplishment of this end Jehovah saw fit to adopt, the Divine Majesty was to the very uttermost justified. The step to which I allude was, through recording in the gospel God's imperative command, to charge upon the hearts and consciences of all faithful ministers of His Word, their obligation to hear, to respect, and to execute His holy will: as it is written,—“*Go ye into ALL THE WORLD and preach the gospel TO EVERY CREATURE—beginning at CHRIST-CRUCIFYING JERUSALEM:*” and again,—“*I saw another angel fly in the midst of heaven, having the everlasting gospel to preach unto them that DWELL ON THE EARTH, and to EVERY NATION, AND KINDRED, AND TONGUE, AND PEOPLE, saying with a loud voice, Fear God, and give glory to him; for the hour of his judgment (that is, preliminary judgment) is come: and worship (that is, in place of stocks and stones) him that made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and the fountains of waters.*” (Rev. xiv. 6, 7.) This preaching of the gospel everywhere, that is, in all places (without picking and choosing) to which in the course of providence the servants of the cross may be sent, has for its effect, through that contempt of the message of life which is by the non-elect invariably displayed wherever the Crucified Redeemer is thus lifted up, to justify to the hearts of the archangels in light the wisdom and character of Jehovah, in His ultimate judgment of all the remaining sections of the earth; that is, in the severest phase of His final justice toward that other portion of the human race, which has lived and died in regions of the world where the Son of God has *not* been lifted up. For by this indiscriminate preaching of the gospel of peace in all places without picking and choosing to which in providence the feet of the preachers of the Church may tend, and that unanimous rejection by the non-elect of the proffer of life which is thereby virtually tendered, it is in a manner the most full and satisfactory proved, what would have been the treatment of that proffer, had it actually been proclaimed in all the remaining portions of the world, where it has not. And thus, to the joy of pure angels above, the confusion of devils beneath, despite the very severest phase of His righteous judgment in the case of the non-elect, the goodness and righteousness of the Deity are vindicated: as it is written,—“*That thou mightest be justified in thy sayings, and mightest overcome when thou art judged.*” (Rom. iii. 4.)

One remark more, ere concluding, it seems to me highly

expedient that I submit: to wit, that the learned Mr. Philpot himself attempts not to dispute, that the revealed will of Jehovah is as I have affirmed it to be. The words of his admission—exact—are these: “For instance the Scriptures are full of general exhortations to men to perform what certainly appear, at *first sight*, spiritual actions. . . . These and similar passages undoubtedly call upon natural men to repent, believe, and pray, all which are spiritual acts.” (p. 52.) This fact established, ought I maintain, not only to the learned gentleman himself, but to all his ministerial brethren, to have been an effectual and an everlasting antidote to controversy. For in behests deep and inscrutable as those of God, the question claiming decision is not, Can *we* see the wisdom of God in his command? nor, Can *we* detect the justice of that command? nor, Can *we* explain the ultimate use of that command? nor, Can *we* discern it becoming on the part of God to issue that command? Nay: none of these. But simply, IS IT *Jehovah's command*? IS IT *His revealed and unalterable will*, that repentance and faith be through the cross of Christ freely preached to the elect and non-elect? Now it has already by Mr. Philpot been granted, that according to the only infallible rule which has ever been delivered to man, the written Scriptures, IT IS God's command: and this admission at the hand of their great leader, ought with the entire body of the P. R. Baptist Churches—or at least with the whole regenerate or spiritual portion of that body—necessarily to be final; ought to make a clean end of dispute for ever. For if on the admission of the distinguished brother (for many years in some sense recognized as their head) it be established, that what I have asserted and defended verily IS God's command, then, being God's command, unquestionably, the command of God is by His redeemed Church to be obeyed: and to teach contrary to such obedience in the Church of Christ, is, in effect, absolutely and intentionally to set up the standard of rebellion.

By all true Christians then at that time worshipping within the pale of the P. R. Baptist Churches, this question ought on the admission of their own distinguished leader to have been brought to a conclusion three and thirty years ago; ought in 1841, the year of the publication of the “Review” containing those admissions, to have been considered for ever settled; settled on the strength of a maxim having to the sanctified mind all the force of a mathematical axiom; to wit, THAT IN WHAT JEHOVAH POSITIVELY COMMANDS, IN THAT JEHOVAH IS REVERENTIALLY TO BE OBEYED. But since throughout a period so protracted—the three and thirty years mentioned—the P. R. Baptist Churches have not seen fit thus to consider the matter, therefore, according

to the wisdom by the Spirit of God given me, I have myself, as in the person of God, assumed leave with regard to ministerial practice finally and for ever to lay it down,—*That IT IS RIGHT of every true or divinely commissioned preacher of Jesus Christ, in ministering to the masses the gospel of the grace of God, TO DO EXACTLY THAT WHICH JEHOVAH HAS COMMANDED.* And since from the example, teaching, and practice of the only begotten Son of God, that also of all his inspired Apostles, it is provable, that the Lord God *has* openly manifested it to be His will, that His ministering servants do diligently call the non-elect masses to repentance,—since also by the imperial mandate of the gospel He *has* seen fit to demand for that will execution,—therefore, *it is not only RIGHT, as affirmed above, but ABSOLUTELY IMPERATIVE, that the divinely accredited or true messenger of the gospel, the man to whose LOVE AND CARE Jehovah has committed the execution of His counsel, SHOULD BOTH REVERE, AND TO THE LETTER EXECUTE, HIS CREATOR'S INFINITELY WISE AND JUST BEHEST.*

What more? This! That notwithstanding the comeliness of the above proposition, the P. R. Baptist Churches, regarding the deductions of natural reason rather than the infallible record of inspiration, have *not* throughout the three and thirty years mentioned arisen to vindicate upon the admissions of their great leader the wisdom, will, and sovereign right of God. For which sinful neglect of that which was due to the glory of His great name, it has to Jehovah seemed good, at the dying lips of that great leader himself, publicly and most practically to rebuke this inexcusable neglect. Hear then that eminent man, as amid the touching stillness of the death-chamber, and with almost his latest breath, he repudiates—practically and effectually repudiates—the antisciptural dogma four and thirty years previously received from those Churches, and retained to his life's eleventh hour. But how repudiates he it? I answer, by returning to that original line of preaching which marked the earlier day of his ministry, and after the fashion of the Apostles, calling upon his own children—*notwithstanding his perfect ignorance of their election and predestination to life in Christ*—“TO FOLLOW ON TO KNOW THE LORD.” Right! Most scriptural!! Altogether divine!!! I shall not, therefore, (albeit in a position most grindingly so to do), call up in long array the ultra-Calvinistic logic of this distinguished gentleman's lifetime, to set it in all its absurdity over against this truly apostolic conclusion; this last, this clear, this closing *voice, exhortation, call*, of his long, and of its peculiar type, able ministry. Blessed be Jehovah for causing—though it were but with expiring

breath—yet even with the last—this dying saint to assert and vindicate ETERNAL TRUTH. Suffice it therefore to point out, that if ever the grand end in the above GENERAL EXHORTATION as by this affectionate father contemplated is to be fulfilled, it can according to the gospel only be, consequently must infallibly or of absolute necessity be, by the appointed way, to wit, repentance toward God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ." (Acts xx. 21.) This *general exhortation*, then, by which the illustrious Mr. Philpot brought his earthly ministry to a close, substantially considered, does to the uttermost concede all the glorious revealed truth, all the lofty and divine example, which throughout these closely argued pages I exalt. For in conclusion, be pleased to take note, that if it be right of this dying minister on the utmost verge of his temporal existence, and while actually touching the very confines of eternity, to exhort in a general way—*albeit without personal knowledge of their election and predestination to life in Christ*—his own beloved children, then, indisputably, and to the annihilation of all rationalistic objection, it must at any and every past period of the same eminent man's fleeting existence have been equally right, to execute Jehovah's express will, and in a general manner exhort—*albeit without personal knowledge of their election and predestination to life in Christ*—ALL OTHER ELECT AND NON-ELECT SINNERS.

A P P E N D I X.

SECTION FIRST.

THE POWER AND FAITHFULNESS OF JEHOVAH, AS DEEPLY INTERESTED TO CONFIRM THE JUST USE OF HIS GENERAL EXHORTATIONS, ASSERTED : AND THE SUBSTANCE OF A TRUE OR POWERFUL EVANGELICAL MINISTRY TO THE NON-ELECT, SET FORTH AND FROM THE SCRIPTURES ESTABLISHED.

IN carrying out the grand work of overthrowing the errors of a false system, it is in the highest degree obligatory to bear in mind, the still more vital work of establishing every principle of the true. To that high obligation, throughout the whole course of the "Argument for the case of Jehovah," I have, I trust, shewn undeviating respect. One matter, however, which though in a manner the most intimate connected with the sublime truths in this Treatise defended, yet as forming no actual part of them I deemed it essential to the best interests of my design to prevent from intermingling, it would not have been well altogether to pass by in silence. The duty of its handling, therefore, has been reserved for the first section of my Appendix.

The express matter to which reference is here made, is, the imperative duty of the minister of the gospel toward the non-elect: his obligation as one professing to be the very echo of the voice of the Almighty, to declare faithfully, that is, in all its weight, and throughout its entire extent, the truth bearing upon those parties: in other words, set forth or adequately represent to their minds, the whole counsel of Jehovah. But in that portion of revealed truth which bears specially upon this class of the Lord's fallen creatures, nearly all the preachers of the P.-R. Baptist Churches make no secret of the fact, that they are incapable of distinguishing between its wholesome, its invaluable use, and its base and reprehensible abuse. For they admit the more general exhortations to be a part of the Bible, consequently the Word of God, yet hold, that because by persons of Arminian predilection they are frequently abused, therefore, they are to be treated as "ARMINIAN LUMBER," and by a lie denied to have any valid use. How long, might it not pertinently be enquired, will these parties

by deeds in the sight of God make manifest, their need of other eyes to see for them?—ay! need of the very instrument whom they have most despised to go before them, and despite the circumfusing shades of rationalistic darkness, by the clear ray of revealed truth, light them back to the path of honour, of filial obedience, and the divine approbation.

From the whole mass of the foregoing evidence—or to speak more pointedly still, from the example and teaching of the Son of God and his Apostles—the fact being undeniable, that in contradistinction to the unhallowed abuse of the general exhortations of Scripture, there always has been, is still, and ever will be an acceptable or righteous use, therefore, most emphatically I lay it down, that in every department of that just and holy use, the wisdom of Jehovah is most implicitly to be respected. Doubtless, it is a fact, nay! a fact but too naked and manifest, that through the fallen, corrupt condition of man, there exists in connexion with every one of the *common blessings* of life, an *unrighteous* abuse, as well as a true and comely use. Would it answer then, I ask, to apply the expedient of total abandonment in order to provide a remedy? It is evident that it would not. But if even in such *ordinary matters* I dare with all boldness affirm this, then, certainly, with infinitely greater confidence in one involving considerations so stupendous, as the evangelical judgment of the non-elect, and their augmented responsibility through the divine ordinance of gospel preaching. But unfortunately in the present day, there are not a few self-exalted and superlatively wise persons, who because of a very wide-spread abuse of the general exhortations of Scripture, imagine that they champion divine truth and do God service, by altogether renouncing the just use of those momentous passages. Nay! even value themselves upon a bold adoption of the indecorous act of Mr. Philpot—the heaping up of their carnal contempt upon the whole general record of Scripture, as a something altogether worthless, deceptive, Arminian. To all such exceedingly unrighteous judges, therefore, with my eye fixed upon that hour when for the uncompromising verdict of Jehovah I shall stand with them before Him in judgment, I here take leave to point out. First,—that the honour of the Eternal Deity is not merely inseparably connected with the inspired Word, but actually staked upon its professed revelations: that Word having by His own free, His most deliberate act, been constituted the true exponent in Time, of counsels chosen and ratified in Eternity. Secondly,—that in those primordial determinations which have in the Written Word been recorded, there *is no mutability*; their Divine Author changing not, but abiding *the same*, yesterday, to-day, and for ever. Hence, that every

august purpose by His wisdom in eternal council adopted—by His prophets and apostles in the course of time revealed—by His Spirit in the Bible attested—must necessarily throughout the ages to come stand fast : being, unto the glory of that august wisdom by which each was originally conceived, as a monument *from everlasting to everlasting*. And thirdly,—that the residue of the Spirit (that Omnipotent Spirit by the breath and power of whom as well in the physical as spiritual world all the divine purposes are established) is for ever with the Lord. By virtue of the all-prevailing power of Whom, omnipotent in the working of marvels and mysteries is Jehovah : His wisdom with high hand accomplishing (wherever throughout the region of matter or mind He is pleased to put forth strength) the excellent pleasure of His most holy will.

Now if by ultra-Calvinistic theologians, or my intelligent reader the above three purely scriptural propositions be granted, then, it will need but the reflection of a moment to make manifest, that the unhallowed abuse by certain worms of the dust of many undoubted portions of Jehovah's eternal Word, can never have for its effect, to divorce from those excellent revelations the divine honour which is their exclusive guarantee. Secondly, it will to every intelligent mind be equally manifest, that this unhallowed abuse by those who *do* abuse the said undoubted portions of the revealed Word, can never instigate Jehovah to alter in the minutest particular that purpose, to the effecting of which He from everlasting saw fit to ordain it. And thirdly, it will by every individual endowed with discrimination be as nakedly apparent, that the unhallowed abuse by those who *do* abuse the said undoubted portions of the revealed Word, shall never avail to deprive Jehovah of the residue of the Almighty Spirit ; by virtue of the wonder-working efficacy of whom, to carry out or effectually establish those purposes, which through a right use of that Word He has irrevocably predestined. The mighty God, therefore, being infinitely greater than the gratuitous abusers of His truth, consequently equal to the uttermost to frustrate the counsel of those who *do* abuse, confirm and sanctify the faithful service of those who *use*, He is not as the ultra-Calvinistic opponents of His wisdom appear to suppose, under necessity to forego one entire half of his eternal purpose, because certain ignorant persons make a point of abusing His general exhortations. But were it indeed true, that because of the abuse by certain bodies of men of those portions of revealed truth, Jehovah *is* placed under absolute necessity to make sacrifice of a part of His eternal purpose, then, since every portion of divine truth is by this or that body of men *abused*, it is, according to this absurd idea evident, that through

the wilfulness or folly of man, the Supreme Ruler must long since have been driven from the field of His high predestination ; must have seen those decrees which in the counsels of a past ETERNITY had been ratified, made void by the mere accidents of TIME. Thus, infallibly, would the determinations of the Godhead have become a byeword—a hissing : the sceptre of the Supreme Ruler, under the hoof of doctrinal jugglers, self-constituted Popes, and an altogether interminable line of presumptuous pretenders, have lain trampled and everlastingly dishonoured.

But not so with Jehovah ; who is abundantly equal to the defence of his own glory, decrees, and throne. His arm is not shortened that it cannot war : He *can*, He most assuredly *will* give effect to His infinitely wise determinations : will by the identical way chosen, way by inspiration revealed in His word, set up as upon a foundation of adamant, His eternally decreed purpose. *Hence with Him the rectification of the abuse of that which is wholesome and good, is never after the antisciptural wisdom of the teachers of the P. R. Baptist Churches, viz., by the total abandonment of its just, its most righteous use.* Such debasing expediency, such contemptible vacillation of mind may indeed pertain to creatures of clay—creatures of whom the noblest light is but the poor spark of their sin-blinded reason—but is infinitely removed from God ; with whom is no such variableness, neither sign nor shadow of turning. He holds in equal derision both the abuses of those who *do* abuse his general exhortations, and the contemptible acumen of *them*, who under the plea of rectifying those abuses, presume in themselves the existence of right to trample His general exhortations beneath their feet. He *will* before His holy angels, be sure, set forth with the deep mark of His disapprobation all such impertinent pretension ; will demonstrate the wretched spirit at its root to be, the leaven of inordinate pride, self-sufficiency, presumption. Ay ! and when the day of his flesh-confounding judgment shall have fully come, this faithful demonstration of revealed truth, albeit so weak, shall not fail to play out its momentous part.

After the above incontrovertible argumentation, another syllable ought not to be necessary in order to convince, that the puerile, the altogether unjustifiable expedient of the ultra-Calvinistic theorizers, to wit, of abandoning because of an unrighteous abuse of the general truths of Scripture, their just and God-magnifying use, affords a lively, an exceedingly humbling exhibition, not only of the pitiable nature of the wisdom of man, but in the case of the parties more immediately concerned, of the highly defective character of a certain psychical faculty, the which, in common phrase we are accustomed to designate “ the moral sense.”

But before proceeding to distinguish between that scriptural or right use of the general exhortations which I defend, and that abuse which forms the plea for ignoring Jehovah's evangelical purpose in the non-elect, be it said, that I freely concede my Christian brethren of the P. R. Baptist Churches that position for which truthfully enough they contend ; to wit, "THAT ALL MEN, THAT IS, NON-ELECT MEN, ARE NOT IN A SALVABLE STATE:" and, that a superficial, an exceedingly partial and imperfect acquaintance with the substance of the great doctrine of Original Sin, is at the root of that semi-Calvinistic and Arminian opinion which vainly supposes that they are. Such opinion, can only consist with a radically defective knowledge of the sad condition of man through the fall ; his subjection under a not merely superficial, but radical virus of moral corruption. It stands and must necessarily stand, in an utterly faulty estimate of the nature and power of that all-depraving principle, which from the earliest era has siezed upon the soul : and of which the dread effect is, to vitiate the moral tastes, carnalize the affections, ironize the will ; and thus, according to what has rightly been termed the mystery of iniquity—mystery which no mortal ingenuity may avail to penetrate or explain—cause the sending forth from that root or fountain of moral action the human heart, bitter waters, corrupt fruits, sins alone. This deterioration of heart, mind, and will, is so thorough, renders the soul so inveterately, so incorrigibly hostile to the thrice holy Person and pure ways of God, that with reference to our fallen humanity the Incarnate Son has himself specially, ay ! most emphatically avouched, that such is its moral obliquity—such its determined, its desperate antagonism—its absolutely self-destructive bent—bent toward evil and against Jehovah—that the free proffer itself of eternal life cannot move it : as it is written,—"*And ye WILL NOT COME TO ME that ye might HAVE LIFE.*" For which reason, He yet again in connexion with the real or repentant coming of the heart to Him has most justly affirmed, that it is "*not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God.*" as it is written,—"No man can (that is, in contrition of soul) come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him ;" and again, "no man can (that is, as a genuine penitent) come unto me, except it were given unto him of my Father." (Jo. vi. 44, 65.) Not only therefore does the idea of the Universal Redemptionists with regard to the salvability of all men contradict the express witness of Scripture, but stands at diametrical opposition to the actual fact, as made manifest in the personal experience of every regenerate, every spiritually exercised Christian soul. Practically, moreover, the tendency of this superficial, this highly antisciptural notion is,

to flatter carnal and ignorant persons with the idea, that in the unspeakably momentous matter of salvation—despite their fall in Adam, alienation of heart, and state of radical moral corruption—the game is exclusively in their own hands. This grossly false notion I hesitate not to say, examined in connexion with all other false opiates which exist, is found to bear the palm—to be the very chief: affording ample scope for the exercise of that spirit of self-deceit, which in the matter of salvation is so common to fallen humanity, to wit, that he, or she, will yet at some time, never however definitely fixed, prove corrupt self equal to the exigency—turn to the Lord—and thus secure salvation: as it is written,—“And as he (Paul) reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, Felix trembled, and answered, Go thy way for this time; when I have a more convenient season, I will (that is, with a view to deal with the subject) call for thee.” (Acts xxiv. 25.) With any such soul-delusive tenet as the above, therefore, except only in the weightiest to condemn, I have in this faithful Treatise nothing to do.

And once more, be it said, that I freely concede my Christian brethren of the P. R. Baptist Churches the yet further position for which truthfully enough they contend; to wit, that that practice which by certain semi-Calvinists and Arminians has been founded on the above exceedingly defective view of the fall, to wit, of *practically and substantially asserting the existence IN IMPENITENT MAN of power immediately to believe on Christ, and by this IMPENITENT WILL-BELIEF lay hold of (“accept” as it is called) salvation*, is a still further abuse of divine truth: all which assertion of will-power to believe unto salvation, is set up, unquestionably, on a misunderstanding of God’s intent in the general exhortations. This sadly delusive practice, which in absolute contempt of the very first call of the gospel to *repentance*, virtually ascribes to the creature while yet *impenitent* the power of believing unto life—practice adopted with express design to *overleap or evade* the natural difficulty of repentance—is, unquestionably, as unscriptural and unwarrantable as the former error; has the effect, moreover, of plunging tens of thousands of ignorant souls into strong delusion. It is therefore most fully to be conceded, that in a right or scriptural way, that is, *by a more faithful exhibition of the divine grace and counsel*, this abuse is to be resisted: for unquestionably, in equal degree with the unscriptural notion of the salvability of all men, does this false dealing furnish that which is best calculated to divest divine truth of its solemnity, and drug the souls of the impenitent with the lying opiate of a *presumptuous self-sufficiency*. In this place again therefore, I *beg most explicitly to avouch*, that with soul-delusive error such

as this—arising manifestly from a total misunderstanding of the divine purpose in the general exhortations, and a consequent straining of these far beyond their just, their legitimate bound—except only in the weightiest to condemn, I have in this faithful Treatise absolutely nothing to do.

With design to bear witness to the whole truth of Scripture, the grand testimony of Jehovah in its integrity, harmony, glory, I have now laid arresting hand on the above antiscriptural fallacies ; have also freely conceded all genuine Calvinists the right, lawfully, or by an exhibition of truth more perfect, to expose or make manifest such error ; and now, to the end that the redeemed Church, the Bride of the Lamb, may in every department of her office be fully instructed—may as co-worker with the Spirit of God in the regeneration be found faithful—I proceed, with as much simplicity as the nature of the case may admit, to touch both the office and true substance of the ministry. The Lord aiding, I shall here for the guidance of every spiritually enlightened conscience most explicitly lay down, what those several heads of gospel ministration actually are, *which with respect to the non-elect have by Jehovah been considered indispensable*. If the Holy Scriptures alone be admitted as evidence, I shall, in laying down each of the several propositions which are to follow, seal the truth in suchwise, that neither human prejudice, nor the wickedness of Satan, shall for a single moment find scope to gainsay.

But in treating this momentous subject, with a view the more accurately to distinguish from man's hateful abuse, the Lord's just and admirable use of the more general truths of Scripture, I shall to secure explicitness, divide the duty of the faithful evangelist under seven distinct heads. That each department of his gospel ministration standing out before the eye in bold relief, may, by the most obtusely minded of the company of the preachers, be at a single glance very thoroughly apprehended. But it is not from my adoption of such divisions to be inferred, that I am seeking to lay down a series of stereotyped rules ; rules by which, in the discharge of his office, to limit and bind the faithful servant of Jehovah ; rules to the exact bound of which, but not an inch beyond, every preacher of the gospel is at all times, and despite the varying phase of circumstance to be by sanction of the Church of Christ restricted. Nay. For it *should*, and doubtless *will* to every reflecting and intelligent Christian mind be evident, that the dexterous management of the more general truths of the Word must to a considerable extent be left to that wisdom, zeal, faithfulness, which through immediate spiritual anointing from above, may at the critical moment of testifying be vouchsafed to the

preacher. This guiding power of Jehovah in the heart of His instrument, must to a very large extent, govern the ministry; that is, by restraint on the one hand, constraint on the other, to an amazing degree modify both the manner and intensity of the address. But leaving now that fact, and taking in connexion with the influence of the Spirit a much wider range—extending our view beyond the mere instrument in the work of preaching, and suffering it to embrace the entire assembly in which the Word is being preached—be pleased to mark: that this divine influence of the Holy Ghost, being a blessing the presence of which is apprehensible purely through the sentient faculty of the soul, its intelligent feeling, its spiritually initiated consciousness alone, therefore, were it on any occasion even generally shed upon an assembly, that fact, (supposing always the instrument or minister leading the service of Jehovah to be a holy, anointed, spiritually-discerning man), would in all likelihood be far more clearly apprehended, more fully and more feelingly experienced by him, than by any other less interested, less intimately concerned party. Admitting the probability, or at least the possibility of this, let us now take a case in point. It might upon a certain occasion please God, to grant in the midst of a congregation a somewhat wide or general breath of His Holy Spirit; which extraordinary manifestation of divine influence, while in degree greater or less experienced by all, is even more powerfully apprehended by the soul of the preacher. It becomes to him beyond question evident, that the breath of the Eternal Spirit is resting on his appointed ordinance: that fact—even externally—being witnessed by supernatural pressure upon the whole audience of a deep and portentous solemnity. I say then, that in such a season of felt visitation, the instrument is to be free; perfectly free to take advantage of such gale of the Spirit, and while hearts and minds are under its deeply solemnizing influence, press home upon all present whatever weighty warnings, exhortations, calls, reproaches, dread threatenings, et/cætera, are in that most interesting of moments poured in upon his soul. Under circumstances thus unusually auspicious, he is I say to be free—as free certainly to apply urgent and general exhortation, as were the Apostles of Christ; and in the grand work of thrusting home upon conscience either the word of awakening or the call to faith—the truth unto breaking or truth unto binding—doctrine gendering to rebuke, or doctrine gendering to consolation—no man is authorised to make him an offender: that is, by false and gratuitous conclusion that such exhortation is contrary to the *doctrines* of divine grace, go forth privately to slander his *ministry*. I say that no man is authorized to do this, for in

effect, it is the act of the Master that is slandered in the servant; no man being able to reproach such faithfulness in the ministry of the latter, without in the same degree reproaching it in that of the Former. Now all the accredited or official Agents of Jehovah—they upon whose divine warrant and inspiration the Church of Christ was originally founded—did themselves in the ordinary course of their ministry, daily, earnestly, and incessantly exhort sinners. But if for the doing of *such* things, the Lord of glory and His inspired Apostles cannot by the acumen of worms of clay be proved to be offenders, so neither by the acumen of such worms can the more modern ambassador of the Lord's gospel. For that man, treads in the very track which was marked out by the Deity—the footprints, exact, of his Redeemer and God. Moreover, that very preaching of the Divine Master and his Apostles—even such general, such indiscriminating preaching as many condemn but I defend—did the Spirit of God as much in righteousness as wisdom, wisdom as righteousness, sanctify to the repentance, faith, and salvation of tens of thousands. Nor this in the ministry of the Son of God and his inspired Apostles alone: nay! but in that of His true servants of all subsequent epochs and ages: the era of the primitive Church—of the Reformation—of the good old Puritans—and of dates even more modern still. Bear witness the faithful labours of His servants, in every clime, nation, people, kindred, and tongue: as Wycliffe, Huss, Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, Cranmer, Knox, Owen, Bunyan, Berridge, Flavel, Newton, Whitfield, Hart, Harris, Roland; ay! and of sanctified witnesses beside, a mighty host far too numerous to name. Now despite the disapprobation of ultra-Calvinists and exclusives, all this, in token of His steadfast sanction of the right use of apostolic exhortation, hath the Lord Jehovah with his own omnipotent breath and influence wrought. Surely then, when with open face as in a glass man beholds His work, the insignificant creature might well be content with Eli to say,—“IT IS THE LORD: LET HIM DO WHAT SEEMETH HIM GOOD.”

Having in justice to the Lord Jesus Christ, charity to those entangled in the toils of carnal reason, delivered myself of the above necessary reflections, I now in a highly condensed form proceed to lay down those express requirements, which, taken together, do with respect to the indiscriminate ministration of the gospel, constitute the actual substance of the divine will. According to the Scriptures then, or at least, the extent to which my poor yet long-exercised judgment apprehends those Holy Writings, (and I think that in measure I have the Spirit of God), the substance of a true and powerful evangelical ministry toward the masses—or to speak more explicitly toward the care-

less and unregenerate—to sinners as sinners—is under the seven following propositions with indifferent accuracy represented.

1. That in the work of publicly ministering the gospel of peace to the unregenerate, the servant of Christ is in the sight of God bound to account himself as one by the Lord himself set for a guide to the blind,—a light to them that sit in darkness, and the region of the shadow of death: hence to Jehovah a debtor, and that to the utmost extent of which in an instrumental point of view the case admits, to pour in upon the dark recesses of such souls the glorious light of evangelical truth: not such truth as concerns the regenerate saints merely, with which in a state of unregeneracy they can have no possible concern; but the very weightiest of those truths which bear upon their own most unhappy condition, to wit, as dying men shortly to be plunged into eternity, and in judgment confronted with Jehovah. As it is written,—“How then shall they call on him in whom they have *not believed*? and how shall they believe in him of whom they have *NOT HEARD*? and how shall they hear *WITHOUT A PREACHER*?” (Rom. x. 14.)

2. That in publicly ministering the gospel of peace to the souls of the unregenerate, a broad and distinct line of demarkation between converted and unconverted, saved and unsaved, saint and sinner, be at all times with strict vigilance preserved: and this clear line of distinction being drawn, the truths for instruction, sanctification, caution, wisdom, comfort, edification, et cætera—called in Scripture meat of the children—be ministered exclusively to the former; the truths for conviction, condemnation, awakening, warning, enlightening, obedience to the faith, et cætera, be ministered to the latter. As on the first head it is written,—“It is not meet to take the children’s bread and cast it to dogs.” (Matt. vii. 6.) And on the second,—“For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or evil. *Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, WE PERSUADE MEN.*” (2 Cor. v. 10, 11.)

3. That in publicly ministering the gospel of peace to the souls of the unregenerate, the doctrine of the fall, together with that consummate ruin of the human race in Adam which constitutes the actual necessity of the atonement, be at all times unreservedly exhibited; the length and breadth of the fatality involved, to wit—the divine imputation of the original sin—the moral and physical corruption of man consequent on transgression—his *indisposition* to all good—*predisposition* to all evil—just *condemnation* by the law—and danger of everlasting damnation—

fatality which without distinction or difference has come upon the whole race, be fully and distinctly unfolded; while at the same time, that responsibility which has by God been determined for *actual offences*—the sins of the flesh, life, and spirit—be steadfastly set forth and asserted. As on the first head, or with reference to the original sin it is written,—“Wherefore as *by one* sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon *all men*, for that ALL HAVE SINNED:” and again,—“Therefore by the offence of *one*, judgment came upon *all men* TO CONDEMNATION.” (Rom. v. 12, 18.) So also as on the second head, or with more immediate reference to personal and actual transgression it is written,—“*The wages of sin is death.*” (Rom. vi. 23.)

4. That in publicly ministering the gospel of peace to the souls of the unregenerate, that particular portion of the divine counsel which is peculiar to the Covenant of Equity be ever faithfully and explicitly unfolded, to wit, that a free proffer of life, *but under the equitable requirement of genuine or heart repentance toward God*, is by Jehovah set forth in the presence of his enemies; of the elect first, but also of the non-elect. As it is written,—“From that time Jesus began to preach, and to say, *Repent: for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.*” (Matt. iv. 17.) And at the same time, that all impenitent parties be in the name of God faithfully and solemnly warned, that their contempt of this divine summons to heart repentance, must and shall in the equity of Jehovah be imputed as guilt—guilt so real, as infallibly to bring down upon their souls an augmented or evangelical condemnation. As it is written,—“Then began he to upbraid the cities wherein most of his mighty works were done, because they *repented not*,” saying, “Woe unto you! . . . for it shall be *more tolerable* for Tyre and Sidon in the day of judgment—yea! *more tolerable* for Sodom herself in that day—than for you.” (Matt. xi. 20, 22, 24.)

5. That in publicly ministering the gospel of peace to the souls of the unregenerate, that other particular portion of the divine counsel comprehended in the Covenant of Equity—portion which for the purpose of giving consistency to the former by providing in the event of repentance for the remission of sin, be ever faithfully and explicitly unfolded; to wit, that forgiveness of sin, *but on the equitable requirement of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ*, is by Jehovah set forth as a warrant of trust to the contrite. As it is written,—“Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man *is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: and by him ALL THAT BELIEVE are justified from all things*, from which ye could not be justified by the law of

Moses." (Acts xiii. 38, 39.) And in addition to this, that all unbelieving parties be in the great name of God continually and most solemnly warned, that their contempt of this divine summons to faith, shall in the equity of Jehovah be infallibly imputed as guilt : guilt bringing down upon them an augmented—a purely evangelical condemnation. As it is written,—“If any man hear my words, and *believe not*, I judge him not : for I came not to judge the world, but to save the world. *He that REJECTETH ME, and receiveth not MY WORDS, hath one that judgeth him*: the word that I have spoken, the same *shall judge him* in the last day.” (Jo. xii. 48, 49.) And again,—“For we are unto God a sweet savour of Christ, in them that are saved, and in them that perish : *to the one we are the savour of death unto death ; and to the other the savour of life unto life.*” (2 Cor. ii. 15, 16.)

6. That in publicly ministering the gospel of peace to the souls of the unregenerate, that further particular portion of divine truth as both to elect and non-elect by the Spirit of God very faithfully declared, be most freely and explicitly unfolded ; to wit, that through a corrupt heart, and wicked will, all unregenerate persons as to their dispositional or moral state, are inveterately opposed to the above equitable requirements : by which is meant, that through the aboundings of selfishness, pride, carnal desire, hardness of heart, and ungodliness, they are far too effectually indisposed to repentance and faith, ever without the grace of the Holy Spirit to be conformed to those indispensable requisitions. As it is written,—“That which is *born of the flesh is flesh* ; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit.” (Jo. iii. 6.) And again,—“It is the Spirit that quickeneth ; *the flesh profiteth nothing.*” (Jo. vi. 63.) And yet again,—“Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water (that is, the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, see Titus iii. 5) and of the Spirit, *he cannot enter into the kingdom of God :*” (Jo. iii. 5.) And in addition to this fact that it be yet further declared, that because of the above dispositional hostility to the equitable requirements of God, therefore, to every individual sinner the sole alternative left is, either earnestly to seek grace of the Holy Spirit unto genuine repentance and faith, that he may live ; or seek not that grace, and in nature’s obduracy, impenitence, and unbelief, perish under a deeper damnation. As it is written,—“God hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth . . . that they should SEEK THE LORD, if haply they might feel after him, and find him.” (Acts xvii. 26, 27.) And again,—“SEEK YE THE LORD while he may be found, CALL YE UPON HIM while he is near : let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts : and let him return unto the

Lord, and he will have mercy upon him ; and *to our God*, for he will abundantly pardon." (Is. lv. 6, 7.)

7. That in publicly ministering the gospel of peace to the souls of the unregenerate, that further particular portion of divine truth, as by the Spirit of God revealed in the Covenant of Equity, be most faithfully, most explicitly unfolded ; to wit, that disregarding and despising the above requirements of Jehovah—those requirements of repentance and faith which constitute the indispensable, the sole comely state of heart on which through Christ He can bestow the free blessing of pardon and life—and by an evil act of the mind or will choosing ungodliness, that is, nourishing toward Jehovah cold contempt, causeless enmity, hate—all such parties in the even balances of His eternal equity weighed, are accounted self-elected to death : are by practical demonstration, in the presence of angel and archangel made manifest, *as self-destroyers* : as men, as women, who with the eye of their mind wide open to the result, have deliberately *turned from* a free proffer on equitable conditions of life, and determinedly, or by calm personal election of their own will, chosen eternal death. As it is written,—“ *And ye, WILL NOT come to me, THAT YE MIGHT have life.*” (Jo. v. 40.) And again,—“ *Your blood be UPON YOUR OWN HEADS ; I (that is, Christ in his servant Paul) AM CLEAN.*” (Acts xvii. 6.)

I have now, not according to any preconceived notions of my own mind, but on the infallible dicta and authority of the eternal Word—that Word, which in its divinity, its immutability, its inviolability, like a giant bulwark against the frauds of the rationalizer stands impregnable and triumphant for ever—set forth the substance of that testimony, which for the carrying out of the sublime purpose of Jehovah, constitutes a faithful, and a powerful evangelical ministry. Let it therefore be clearly understood, that the whole body of this department of the ministry stands separate and distinct from that other department of it, which has exclusive reference to the saints : and the peculiar province of which is, the instruction, guidance, edification, comfort, and sanctification, of the true children of God. In the light of this simple exposition, and to the confusion of the sophistry of all who rely upon reason it may now very plainly be seen, that with the smallest measure of management on the part of the preacher, these two distinct departments of his office can neither interfere with each other, nor yet compromise divine truth, nay ! nor in the slightest degree prejudice their respective ends. But contrariwise, combinedly and with dexterity used, must infallibly unite their moral influence, weight, instrumental power, (call it by whatever name you will), in a manner the most

effectual to impress, both saint and sinner : and in the case of the unregenerate mass, (the elect portion as much as the non-elect), affect in a way the most wholesome the heart ; urge in a direction the most safe the whole intellectual being. How then, in the following Article lately published in the "Gospel Standard," (Article with the disgraceful substance of which I am next under imperative obligation to deal), do certain untruthful witnesses of these latter days give us to understand,—“That that evangelical ministry which in infinite wisdom God has deputed to the unregenerate, and those general exhortations which as a befitting means to its execution have by Himself been lodged in the Bible, are a ministry and a manner of exhortation (*doubtless through the egregious blundering of the Lord Jehovah*), which applied to those lofty ends for which by that Holy One they were designed, (I here according to the following Article quote their own words—exact), ‘MUST CERTAINLY CARNALIZE AND RUIN OUR CHURCHES.’”

SECTION SECOND.

NOTES ON A HIGHLY INDECOROUS ARTICLE, BY SOME ANONYMOUS WRITER PUBLISHED IN THE MAGAZINE CALLED “GOSPEL STANDARD,” IN THE MONTH OF DECEMBER, 1871.

LEST by any party more zealous for the honour of man than God it should be thought, that the task to which in defence of divine truth I have in this Treatise set myself might have been eschewed, and the name and theological reputation of a master in Israel spared, I beg to call the attention of the person thus judging, that also of all the truly godly within the pale of the P. R. Baptist Churches, to the pernicious fruits of this renowned man's deviations ; as sadly illustrated in the opinions, and writings, of his unreflecting and too servile imitators.

In Part First, page 4 of this demonstrative Work, I have taken care to make manifest, that that unhallowed teaching of Mr. Philpot by the branding of which I have the glory of justifying against His accusers the immaculate Jehovah, was republished, and by very general acceptance of the Churches re-exalted as truth in the year 1872. But not only this : for in the year immediately preceding, viz. 1871, I find in an Article by some anonymous writer in the accredited Organ of these Churches—the “Gospel Standard”—the very same antisciptural teaching, the very same fallacious reasoning, the very same theological blundering not only re-exhibited, but with a malice toward the

witness of Scripture altogether unaccountable, so palmed upon the prejudices of the ignorant, as to incite to more determined hostility than ever, toward the wisdom, will, and sovereign right of the Creator. All Mr. Philpot's intense confusion of thought, falseness of argumentation, and presumptuous contradicting of the Holy Ghost, are by this servile imitator of a most incomprehensible master, called into requisition; and with that imbecile triumph inseparable from the vanity of the sciolist—the man who exhibits himself in the borrowed plumage of second-hand opinion—vociferously exalted. Nay, worse: in that inordinate pride of spirit which is the leading characteristic of all who rely upon reason—such pride, as actually emulative of the infallibility arrogated by the priesthood of Rome, suffers not against its personal dictum the voice of God in the Scriptures to be heard—are, I deeply regret to be obliged to say, under the mask of a counterfeit zeal for truth, once more to the blind credulity of the ignorant commended; once more wickedly thrust upon the unreflecting, as that which claims most religiously to be defended.

A few specimens of the borrowed wisdom, personal incompetency, and soul-engrossing egotism of this high contributor to the "Gospel Standard," I deem it my duty for general admiration to record: it is meet that one who upon the assumed theological acuteness of his own mind thus inordinately values himself, should also have the advantage of manifestation to the minds of his brethren. That it may be so, I proceed to quote from that Article which by the way of a wisdom at second-hand—the wisdom of his exemplar Mr. Philpot—this proud writer has contrived to furnish. He says,—“We complain that there is little doing among us, in the way especially of conversion. Now, then, is the time to say the preaching has all been defective. Sinners should be not only addressed and warned, *but told to repent, believe, and perform SPIRITUAL AND SAVING ACTS.* But let us weigh things well, and see whither this will inevitably, pushed to its proper and logical conclusion lead us. *If SPIRITUAL SAVING ACTS are a part of a natural man's duty,* where is the doctrine of election? Where is special redemption? And where Paul's declaration that in Christ Jesus neither circumcision avails anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.” (p. 514.) Through those passages in this remarkably absurd extract which by the use of diverse type I have particularized, it will to all who have attended me throughout the demonstrations of this Treatise be at a glance manifest, that the wisdom set forth in the unhallowed Article before us, is nothing more than a reproduction at the hand of this pitiable copyist, of the rationalistic notions of

his master and exemplar the Rev. Joseph Charles Philpot. For a full exposure of which notions, together with that gratuitous hostility to divine truth which invariably attends them, I refer the reader to chapter second of the "Argument for the case of Jehovah." The inquirer who is desirous thoroughly to understand the enormous theological blundering, the gross and palpable error in connexion with that insanely devised, that absolutely fallacious term—"SPIRITUAL ACTS"—will, in the chapter indicated, find an instrument all-sufficient to that end. What therefore in considering the above absurd extract needs particularly to be insisted on is, that from the enormous mass of evidence on the pages of this Book it is certain, that the present is not merely the time to say that the preaching has all been defective, but, if the glory of God—His wisdom, will, and sovereign right be admitted into the consideration—then, of a very truth, *far too late in the day*. It ought by every faithful witness within the P. R. Baptist Churches, to have been done a full century it may be earlier. But forasmuch as it has not, I myself, (*very late in the day I grant*), have at the instances of God assumed leave not merely to say, but against the hour of judgment finally and most effectually demonstrate, that the preaching in question—preaching which this too servile copyist of Mr. Philpot would evidently desire to see justified—has been altogether one-sided; utterly short of the whole counsel of God; and by consequence, in equity absolutely condemnable as defective. Expressly to witness which, and with no other aim, I have made it my business to record all that elaborate argumentation, which actually freights and saturates the logical pages of this Book.

But secondly, with reference to the futile passage under consideration, I take occasion most authoritatively, that is, as in the Person of Jehovah and on his behalf to lay it down, that whatever the inordinate pride of this self-complaiscent writer may imagine, whatever the unbridled presumption of his tongue assume leave to fiat forth, yet it abides and shall for ever abide a fact, that fallen souls—sinners of every class, condition, and character—all sinners of the race or lineage of Adam indiscriminately—ought, most unquestionably, by every messenger of the gospel claiming to the divinely begotten principle of Christian faithfulness, to be told *that*—all and exactly *that*—I say to the last letter and syllable in its entirety *that*—which in His instructions to His ministering servants the Lord Jehovah has peremptorily commanded: which also in presence of the whole on-gazing intelligent creation, He through the example of His Son and the inspired Apostles, has, as the undoubted essence of His wisdom, will, and sovereign purpose, practically and irrevocably

demonstrated. But that which to His professing ministers Jehovah has seen fit to command—that which as His will He by the acts of His Son and the elect Apostles has made manifest—that which as a witness to His own eternal excellency He through the Spirit has caused to be recorded—is, that repentance toward God, and faith in His Son for the remission of sins, be in His great name preached among all nations, beginning at Christ-crucifying Jerusalem.” The will and purpose of the Deity therefore being, first, by imperial mandate, secondly, by divine example, and thirdly, by written precept, clear as the meridian sun revealed, it is evident, that despite the impertinent contradicting of this most presumptuous contributor to the “Gospel Standard,” repentance toward God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, *ought*, in the name and on the authority of Jehovah, to be preached home to the heart and conscience of every living sinner: I say every sinner indiscriminately, in every hole and corner throughout the entire earth, to which in the course of providence the gospel minister may be sent. In this matter, God, not the self-intoxicated creature of clay that lifts up an arrogant voice to contradict Him, is to be held righteous, equitable, just; His imperial mandate to be obeyed; the contumacious fiat of every rationalizing worm that would impeach Him, cast with contempt to the harpies of hell.

And here let the intelligent reader be pleased to mark, that while in setting the free proffer of salvation before the guilty, (of the elect first, and also of the non-elect), true repentance toward God, and faith in the sacrifice of His Son, are in divine equity the indispensable requirements, yet the Lord Jehovah in thus standing sponsor for his own infinite wisdom, does not undertake to be responsible either for the proud indiscriminating ignorance, or the ridiculous theological blundering, of this highly irreverent scribe of the “Gospel Standard;” nay! nor for that of any other, the wisdom and intellectual pretension of whom is of a similar type. Such men seem utterly to revel in the luxury of confounding and amalgamating as one, things which are essentially distinct: to wit, *Jehovah's sovereign and most equitable requirement at the hand of the wrong doer of the non-elect; and Jehovah's gracious and free gift through Christ to the wrong doer of the elect.* And having thus lamentably, thus ridiculously blundered, and by an habitual process of stumbling stirred up a cloud of dust too dense by far for the mental eye of their untrained readers by any possibility to penetrate, they pause, and with schoolboy ovation—such triumph as assumes the case to be proven before it is argued—hurl forth from the thick mist of their mud-cloud defiance upon every scriptural remonstrant.

Yet again with reference to the futile passage under consideration, but more particularly those *three transcendently absurd enquiries* by force of which, this astute author designs to crucify the wisdom and faithfulness of every man who in deference to the will of Christ would preach repentance and faith to the unconverted, to wit,—“Where is the doctrine of election?”—“Where is special redemption?”—“Where is Paul’s declaration that in Christ Jesus neither circumcision avails anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature?”—I very calmly (nevertheless with disapprobation as profound for the arrogance, as pity for the naked stupidity of the interrogator) take leave to point out, that the three distinct specialities after which this self-infatuated declaimer so vociferously enquires, *both are, and will for ever abide, exactly where they were—exactly in that original integrity in which they were—and exactly in that stability and glory in which they were—* WHEN THE SON OF GOD WITH HIS OWN DIVINE LIPS, AND THE TWELVE DIVINELY INSPIRED APOSTLES WITH THEIR FIRE-TOUCHED LIPS, YEA ! AND THE GREAT APOSTLE OF THE GENTILES WITH HIS SUBSEQUENTLY YET NOT THE LESS POWERFULLY HEAVEN-ANOINTED LIPS, each and all, in the name and by authority of the Eternal Father, did upon hill top and mountain side, by hedge and by highway, on the sea shores and in the market places, *preach home to the hearts and consciences of sinners—* REPENTANCE TOWARD GOD—AND FAITH IN OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST.

In full view of the simplicity of the above scriptural reply, might we not for a moment at this interesting point pause, and very gravely enquire, Who *is* this remarkably self-important Somebody of the “Gospel Standard,” who through sheer incompetency to estimate aright his own powers, setting up as a Leader and Teacher of his brethren, does against the wisdom, will, and sovereign right of his all-glorious Creator, thus irreverently, thus presumptuously declaim.

But take a yet further brilliant specimen of the theological sagacity of this writer ; one moreover upon which, by reason of its misimagined depth, he evidently values himself. It is once more by this man wise above that which is written, with much magisterial display, much pretension to spiritual acuteness, thus preposterously predicated. “Man by nature, in his first and unfallen state, was but a living soul, and could not be required, as part of his duty, to perform PROPERLY SPIRITUAL ACTIONS. These must have their basis in a nature of a higher order and qualified to produce them. That which is born of the *flesh* can but be flesh. Natural religion can go no farther in its imagination than Nicodemus,—that a man should return into his

mother's womb, and come forth afresh. But Christ cuts all such carnal remedies up, root and branch." (p. 515.) Having already pointed the reader to where he may satisfy himself, as to the ludicrous floundering of this man and his master upon that fallacious but favourite term—"SPIRITUAL ACTS," it is only necessary in this place to point out, the very repulsive character (in a moral point of view) of the judgment delivered by this self-infatuated public instructor. "Man," boldly but vainly dogmatizes the instructor, "by nature, in his first and unfallen state, was but a living soul and could not be required as a part of his duty to perform spiritual actions." With regard to this exquisitely absurd judgment, let the reader be pleased to mark, that when this very edifying writer gives us to understand, that man even in his first and unfallen state having been created but a living soul, could not be required in the way of duty to perform spiritual actions, the author's real meaning is, that this living soul, this immortal spirit which in common language we call *man*, if at any time he transgress the law and commit sin, cannot, with the slightest semblance of justice be by Jehovah required to repent; nay! nor yet under a free proffer of mercy at the hand of that Holy One, be required to believe on the *Lord Jesus Christ*. Such the magisterial statement: statement, it must be admitted, far more remarkable for the strength of the dogmatism and shallowness of the judgment which it exhibits, than for reverence toward God, or delicate perception of the moral sense. I proceed to examine it: let the reader follow, and take note. What then, I ask, is "*a living soul*?" for this conscientious teacher grounds his insane conclusion upon that? Is it not written, "*in the image of God created He him?*" That is, the great Fabricator of the universe, because it seemed good in His sight, did by the breath of His power infuse into the human spirit which He had seen fit to create, immortality, intelligence, affections; by virtue of which excellent endowments, He constituted man a moral agent; or in the language of Scripture, an image (though at infinite distance) of that greatest of all mysteries, the moral and intellectual SPIRIT OF THE UNIVERSE. Thus much with respect to a living soul. Being therefore created, not under those disadvantages which belong to the lower orders of God's creatures, that is, not "as the horse or mule which have no understanding," but with intellectual and moral capacity, hence capable of discerning between right and wrong, justice and injustice, gratitude and ingratitude, we might naturally and most righteously conclude, that if by any means such an one should place himself before his Maker in the position of a *wrong doer*, nothing could possibly be more comely, *more just, more necessary*, than that he should humble himself

in the presence of that justly offended Creator—acknowledge his iniquity—and repent of his evil deeds against Him. Now by virtue of the all-glorious principle of equity peculiar to the divine essence, Jehovah considers the rectitude of the case to be **THAT**. By intuitive allowance of the moral instinct of every intelligent creature also, this view of the Lord of glory is abundantly **RATIFIED**. Yea! and by the unerring voice of conscience in the wrong doer himself, this judgment of God, and of the moral instinct, is secretly, is absolutely **APPROVED**. Notwithstanding all which evidence, however, because of the pre-eminent incompetency of our scribe to distinguish between things that differ; on the one hand the equity of Jehovah which demands of the wrong doer true repentance, on the other, the sovereign goodness of that Holy One which when the equity of the case is despised yet sees fit in the elect to instigate to repentance; therefore, his proud but baffled reason rises up magisterially to inform us—soberly and deliberately inform us—that man being created a living soul (that is, a creature endowed with moral and intellectual capacity, consequently accountable, or a debtor in equity to do every right action), cannot, if in the sight of his Maker he do that which is wrong, (*Hear it ye infernal gods and rejoice!*) cannot, saith our instructor, with any shadow of justice be by that Creator required *to repent*; cannot in the face of mercy freely proffered, be by that glorious Benefactor called upon *to believe*. Ought not this self-constituted but greatly incompetent guide of the blind, instead of fiatting forth judgment pestilential as this, rather to betake himself to a study of the first principles of ethics, if peradventure in this matter and others of like ordinary consideration, he may yet learn to justify the righteousness of the impeccable, the immaculate Jehovah.

But let the reader still further be pleased to observe, that in forbidding, contrary to the Scriptures, that repentance toward God and faith in the Lord Jesus Christ be in the name of God to the fallen preached, this highly edifying writer hesitates not to apply to his unscriptural, his consequently iniquitous purpose, the sublime conversation of Christ with Nicodemus. By which naked perversion of divine truth he has placed himself, I say not simply in the sad, but transcendently absurd position of the man, who represents Christ as against Christ—Christ as the stultifier of Christ—Christ as the public censorer of Christ. For if according to this self-complaisant writer's miserable abuse of the conversation in question, Christ as a divine person, Christ as a fountain of eternal truth, Christ as a public teacher, and the teacher of Nicodemus, be indeed against the preaching of repentance and faith to unregenerate sinners, then, will this modern

Solomon of the "Gospel Standard," or some other equally trustworthy contributor, be pleased to enlighten mankind by demonstrating, *how with anything like a claim to consistency, honour, integrity*, the Son of God could Himself journey from city to village, and from village to city, **DOING DAILY THIS VERY THING?** Will they vouchsafe moreover to show, how by virtue of such personal example, combined with most peremptory command, He could, to the end of time, lay this practice upon the hearts and consciences of His faithful followers? I pause for a reply. But if that reply is to be apart from Carnal Reason, and on the authority of the infallible Scriptures, I very confidently predict, that neither in Time nor throughout Eternity, will our ultra-Calvinistic theorists be enabled to adduce it.

Can the patience of my reader endure the strain of a further extract from the Article before me? extract, in the very highest, illustrative of the superabounding vanity of this greatly conscientious writer: this man, who deeming dogmatism a full equivalent for sound proof, the deductions of rationalistic pride a sufficient substitute for the light of Scripture, forth-fulminates arrogant judgment against his Maker. Endeavouring to apply the above perversions of divine truth to an unholy end, to wit, *to harden in error the ignorant, and instigate to fierce antagonism to God's will*, he says,—“Now then, brethren, if addresses to **UNCONVERTED MEN**, in which they are told to perform saving spiritual acts,” (he means, called by authority of God to repentance and faith), “*are right*, throw both our Review, and the book reviewed (viz., Mr. Philpot's letters) into the fire; both are wrong.” (p. 515.) With regard to this truly ludicrous morsel of pure egotism, (in the highest degree valuable as demonstrative of the self-complacency of all who rely upon reason) I have in the first place to observe, that at this particular point of his reckless race in unsubstantiated assertion, the somewhat too-confident pupil comes into open collision with his distinguished master. For his master, the learned and accomplished Joseph Charles Philpot, in contending against the antisciptural decisions of Mr. Wells, most vehemently asserts, that the inspired Apostles **DID** in the very way which his proud pupil so contemptuously condemns, continually address the unregenerate masses; and that Mr. Wells in wilfully ignoring that fact has not only endeavoured to bury Jehovah's truth, but dealt unrighteously. Which argument the eminent gentleman sees fit to clench with these note-worthy words,—“But that in the Scriptures spiritual exhortations (that is, to repent and believe) are confined to such (that is, such only as the Lord by grace intends to convert), **WE POSITIVELY DENY.**” The rectitude of the Apostles, in this respect, Mr. Philpot, what-

ever his actions imply, never ventured in so many distinct words to impugn. Nay! when it serves for the moment his purpose in opposing Mr. Wells, he even vindicates against the sneers of that person the unimpeachable rectitude of apostolic practice. Hear it, I pray, at his own lips: he says,—“Nor does it at all follow because men are not in a salvable state, or because natural men have no power to perform spiritual actions, *that they may not BE EXHORTED in the Scriptures to do them.*” (March 1841, p. 78.) Now here, full in view, is notable difference between the erudite master, and his highly superficial scholar: yea! not between master and scholar alone, but between this great champion of antiscritptural error and that. For here is Wells against Philpot, and Philpot against Wells: that is, champion against champion. But here also is the writer of the Article upon which I am engaged against Philpot, and Philpot against the writer of that Article: that is, scholar against master, and master against scholar. Now the master vindicates against his contemporary champion, Wells, the rectitude of apostolic addresses to the unconverted: but the self-important, the transcendently egotistical scholar, in direct opposition to his master gives us to understand, *that if we accept the rectitude of the Apostles in their addressess to the unconverted*, then, (by way of penalty) we are that moment to cast his own Christ-dishonouring “Review,” ay! and his master’s book of letters also into the fire. Dread alternative! I accept thee, albeit: nay! judge the wound by such burning premeditated, the very happiest perchance of all which this truly reckless writer ever did, or is likely again to inflict. Taking therefore all heaven and earth to witness, I here publicly upon the rectitude of Jehovah, His Son, His inspired Apostles, and His Book, set the seal of my soul’s deep belief; and these, (jeopardizing life itself unto the death in their defence), as persons and things gloriously, unimpeachably true, I eternally exalt; and the party, it matters not who, that would malign, in obedience to the eternal “LET BE” of Deity, see Rom. iii. 4, hold to be a liar. In token of which conclusion, according to the only alternative under the circumstances by this inexorable author left me, I take (*that is, in spirit*), his so-called “Review,” and the book of letters with which that “Review” professed to deal, and with all the solemnity, the calm deliberation which belongs to an indispensable judicial act, cast both as prescribed into the fire. I have said—not at random—not in haste—not under perturbation of mind—not in puerile, evanescent indignation—but that deeply solemn deliberation which should ever be at the root of judicial procedure—cast into the fire. Even thus, through the very token by this writer himself *proposed*, the only one which under the circumstance his pride

permits me, do I permanently signify the disapprobation, the deep loathing, the utter abhorrence due to that reckless, that unprincipled wresting of divine writ, which, though possibly not intended for the deliberate perpetration of such crime, does, substantially considered, embody the very purest essence of blasphemy. For observe the highly irreverent character, the Deity-debasing recklessness of the statement, which at the pen of this pre-eminently conscientious writer I am considering.

He says,—“Now then, brethren, if addresses to unconverted men in which they are told to perform saving spiritual acts, (he means, called to repent toward God, and believe on our Lord Jesus Christ), ARE RIGHT, throw our Review and the book reviewed into the fire.” I ask every person endowed with the most ordinary measure of intelligence, whether the assumption contained in this passage—assumption which its incompetent author has founded upon his own previous perversion of Christ’s conversation with Nicodemus—does not directly, and to the very uttermost, attest the rectitude of the Spirit of God in the humanity of Christ, in all the inspired Apostles, and in the page of the Holy Bible? For is it not by this author positively asserted, that in the name of Jehovah to call unconverted souls to repentance and to faith, is NOT RIGHT. That which is not right is wrong; and that which is wrong, if done, is done in direct breach of equity; and that which is done in direct breach of equity, is pure wickedness; and that which is down-right wickedness, is by the holy, the just, the ever good law of God denounced as worthy—worthy alone—of the deep damnation of hell. These things are absolutely and eternally irrefutable. Mark next, then, that the Holy Ghost not merely in the humanity of the Son of God, but in all the elect Apostles, and throughout the Bible, does Himself address the call to repentance and faith to unconverted sinners—nay! to such unconverted persons *alone*. For indeed, these being the only parties in a state of impenitence and unbelief, *they constitute the ONLY body of fallen creatures to whom such a call could have any real pertinence or applicability*. For sinners who are already converted, *have* by divine grace passed through repentance; *have* believed for life on the Lord Jesus Christ. Hence to *any others* save careless, unconverted souls, such a call as that of the gospel, viz., to repent toward God and believe for remission of sin on Christ, *must necessarily be altogether absurd*. Despite which fact however, this superlatively wise contributor to the “Gospel Standard” whose profounds I am endeavouring to fathom, indignantly gives us to understand, that if the gospel call to the careless and unconverted be by any of his readers accepted as *right*—be considered to apply and only apply

to UNCONVERTED PERSONS—then, in open token of his, the said contributor's displeasure, the party thus judging is instantly to burn his highly edifying "Review;" yes, and the volume reviewed, to wit, of his master's letters. The Spirit of God, however, being at direct variance with the wisdom of this doctrinal Oracle of the "Gospel Standard," *selects these very parties—UNCONVERTED SINNERS ALONE—and by Christ, the Apostles, and Bible, CALLS THEM SPECIALLY to repentance and faith.* Now what the Spirit of God does, He cannot do at unawares, but must necessarily do by design. Yet this transcendently self-important teacher of the "Standard," with all that bold, reckless effrontery, which is the leading characteristic of the school which supposes fleshly assertion to be infinitely more demonstrative of *truth* than divine oath or sound scriptural evidence, very unceremoniously gives us to understand, that this doing of the Holy Ghost IS WRONG. Here then through His glorious anointing of the humanity of Christ, His excellent action in the inspired Apostles, and His holy witness in the truth of the Bible, is the Eternal Spirit, by decree of the highly indecorous creature before us, *established a doer of wrong.* But if a doer of wrong, then, a doer of wrong by design; for it is manifestly impossible that the Spirit of God should act at unawares. If therefore a doer of wrong by design, then, certainly, a deliberate doer of wickedness; and if a deliberate and wilful doer of wickedness, then, by the holy, the just, the ever good law of Jehovah denounced as worthy, ay! worthy to the very uttermost—*S'death!* the thing is too abhorrent to be written; too dreadful, too detestable by far, for secret conception herself, though but for a fleeting instant, to turn in the appalling direction. "Be astonished, O ye heavens, at this, and be horribly afraid, be ye very desolate, saith the Lord."

Such (substantially considered) the open blaspheming of this reckless class of writers. Considered with respect to intention, I am willing to believe, that through the "gross darkness" of ignorance on the one hand, the blinding influences of prejudice and personal pride on the other, they do *not* fully apprehend the hideous issues of their too vile, too unhallowed imaginings: hence, in unconsciousness to some extent, both of the dreadful insult to God which is involved, the utterly contumacious spirit to which they themselves have become subordinated, give full vent to their detestable deceivings. And strange to say, all this—ay! by tens of thousands in the P. R. Baptist Churches is read, discussed in private, and ultimately as defence of truth—noble championship of divine doctrine—suffered: nay! more; as something madly conceived to be well-pleasing in the sight of God, with acclaim, with high encomium exalted.

Once more let the reader open his ears and hear. Our author yet further at the expense of God and the divine wisdom, proceeds to disburden his soul of its superabundance as follows. "These things" (he here refers to the several truths of the fall, the moral corruption and impotency of man, and regeneration by the Holy Spirit) "and the doctrines of grace, cannot really *stand in the long run together with such addresses*" (he means, addresses calling careless souls to repentance and faith). "It is the thin end of the wedge; and what matters it *if Satan uses even good men to insert it?* The beginning of the departure may seem small; disregarded, it will certainly *carnalize and ruin our churches.*" (p. 515.) Such the further dogmatical averment of this crudest of thinkers—this most insane of all doctrinal dreamers. Again with intent to make it good, I affirm, that if as to its actual substance this passage be considered, then, in diabolical wickedness it infinitely transcends that which has gone before: for granting the *former* to be blasphemous, *this* must be held to be the very rancour of blasphemy. The root from which it springs is on the surface, is to be found as soon as sought: in short, is the inordinate vanity which pertains to fallen, and for that cause superlatively proud human REASON. It is not even concealed by writers of this reckless class, that they make their rationalistic darkness—in other words, their natural ignorance—at any and every time an ample pretext for contemptuously trampling underfoot revealed truth. If they cannot detect, what by *their* poor spark of intelligence is deemed a satisfactory *reason* for the infinitely wise procedure of Jehovah, then, that personal inability is to themselves ground more than sufficient, to warrant in an arbitrary setting aside of the most august of the divine counsels which baffle them. Hence by one, Mr. Wells, the whole of the more general portion of the Bible, for no other crime than that it happens to be too gloriously bright for the darkness of his rationalistic mind to decipher, is denounced as "*utterly useless, mere mockery of men, and solemn trifling.*" By another, the learned Mr. Philpot, the same inspired portion of divine truth, for no additional cause, but *that* only to which I have referred, is branded as "*self-contradiction, Arminian lumber, and a thing fit only at the hands of men of truth to be tossed overboard.*" By a third, the crude, superficial, argumentationless contributor to the "Gospel Standard" before us, the same divine portion of the Word, and for no further offending than *that* which has already been explained, is blasphemed as *wicked, a wedge in the hand of Satan, and an instrument by which to corrupt and ruin the churches.* Thus the standard of appeal which by these rationalizing declaimers is invariably set up, as by any mind gifted with the most ordinary discrimination

may at a single glance be detected, is the natural darkness, blindness, ignorance, incompetency, impotency, (call it by what name you please), of their own minds. Having dragged to light this false standard of NATURAL REASON, according to which, exclusively, at the hand of the writer before us carnal judgment proceeds, I am next by obligation the most sacred bound to deal with *the substance* of the statement above cited.

First then, is it indeed true, as by this extremely intelligent guardian of the P. R. Baptist churches asserted, that the truths of the fall, of man's moral disability, of regeneration by the Spirit, and the doctrines of sovereign grace, *cannot long stand together with the preaching of the gospel to the unconverted?* By not a few in these days of man-worship, the judgment of our scribe is implicitly believed. Not willing however in a question like this altogether to trust to my own wisdom, I turn to the inspired Scriptures; and from the unerring record by the finger of God there traced, I find it abundantly evidenced, that through the wisdom of the inspiring Spirit the general exhortations of the Son of God, those also of the elect Apostles, do still continue to stand along with all the other solemn verities to which reference has been expressly made. The fact being so, once more at that sacred page I make demand; that I may, if it be possible, ascertain how long. What then do I find? That for at least nineteen hundred years, nay! from the foundation of the world and before, even the immeasurable lapse of a past eternity, these things have in the ante-typographical Bible—even the page of the inscrutable wisdom of Mind Divine—continued steadfastly to stand together. It does therefore, I maintain, seem somewhat late in the day for this highly untrustworthy witness of the "Gospel Standard" to insist that his darkness is light: that that cannot be, which practically evidences both that it can be, yea! and is: and that these two which throughout the immeasurable span of a past eternity have thus steadfastly stood together, cannot for long thus stand. I say, that it is, or at least ought to be somewhat too late in the day, for the professing Christian Church to receive as an instrument of edification assertion base and reckless as this.

But let the reflective inquirer yet further be pleased to take note, that the more effectually to work upon the prejudices of his for the most part uneducated readers, and thus give currency to his most iniquitous opinions, this prince of truth-perverting spirits shrinks not—recoils not—from the hideous impropriety of maintaining, that the truth, the sober fact in connexion with addresses calling unconverted sinners to repentance and faith is, that such *preaching* constitutes the thin end of a wedge, which with design to destroy the spiritual prosperity of the P. R. Baptist Churches,

Satan by the hand of good men would insert: the express words are these, "*It is the THIN END OF THE WEDGE; and what matters it if SATAN USES EVEN GOOD MEN to insert it? The beginning of THE DEPARTURE may seem small: disregarded, it will certainly CARNALIZE AND RUIN OUR CHURCHES.*"

This unprecedented passage, on which in judicial righteousness I feel it absolutely indispensable to set the brand mark DIABOLICAL, is not merely blasphemous, but contains the concentrated essence of that most detestable principle. I proceed to exhibit the proof. Mark then, that whereas the great master of the pretentious writer before us, the Rev. J. C. Philpot, in opposition to the misrepresentations of Mr. Wells vehemently contends, "that the Son of God himself, and all His inspired Apostles, did, in their daily ministration of the gospel to the unconverted, make diligent use of indiscriminate exhortations to repentance and faith; and that such preaching is not necessarily useless because Mr. Wells is too blind to see its use, nor trifling because he is too ignorant to detect its import and beauty;" while the great master of this arrogant Somebody of the "Gospel Standard" thus righteously condemns the open blaspheming of Mr. Wells, yet the bold pupil too headstrong, too self-sufficient by far to profit by his master's caution, casts off common decency itself, and giving loose rein, nay! unbridled licence to the ribaldry of his heart, forth-fiats as follows. "The respect which in word at least Mr. Philpot would maintain toward this preaching to the unconverted, is superfluous; his caution altogether misapplied; for I (would it not be well for the Churches to enquire who this great I of the "Gospel Standard" may be?) give the whole Christian community plainly to understand, that such preaching is but the thin end of the wedge, which with express view to split up the spiritual health of the Church-Elect, *Satan makes use of even good men (to wit, THE GOD-MAN JESUS CHRIST, AND ALL HIS DIVINELY INSPIRED APOSTLES) to insert. The beginning of the departure (that is, OF THE SON OF GOD AND ALL HIS INSPIRED APOSTLES FROM THE TRUTH) may seem small; disregarded, it will certainly carnalize (SAVE US THEREFORE, O LORD, FROM THY SON AND HIS APOSTLES!) and ruin our churches.*" Now were the hideous opinions of this marvellously ill-advised person true—were his fallacious assertions worth the unhappy paper which they so utterly pollute and deform, then, it is self-evident, that through the immediate preaching of that most exalted of gospel ministers, the LORD JESUS CHRIST—the preaching also of those only inspired ministers who have ever lived, the TWELVE APOSTLES and great apostle of the Gentiles, PAUL—every church, from the forthgoing of the Baptist to the death of be-

loved John by the Spirit of God founded, must necessarily have been "CARNALIZED AND EFFECTUALLY RUINED:" for the Son of God himself, and in like manner all His inspired Apostles, the mighty Paul in particular, spent the whole term of their public labour on earth in testifying indiscriminately to all comers—"Repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ." For the release therefore of those divinely accredited witnesses from the diabolical imputation by this egotistical writer cast upon them, I call upon the P. R. Baptist Churches to ponder these facts—to cast away prejudice—and as men themselves shortly destined to be judged, to judge righteous judgment. As far as I personally am concerned, I frankly confess, that I am sufficiently prejudiced in favour of the Son of God and *His* wisdom, the elect Apostles and *their* wisdom, to believe better things of their ministry than those by this unprincipled scribe reported: but were I even less biassed, I think I might with a measure of honesty venture to affirm, that I should still, if not from deep reverence yet at least in very shame, shrink from that reckless spirit of blasphemy in which, manifestly, this greatly guilty contributor to the "Gospel Standard" takes delight absolutely to wallow.

What conclusion be it now enquired remains to those, who can read, with their influence uphold, nay! actually extol the treasonable speculations of this prince of religious instructors? There can be but one: it is this. To wit, that upon the very dogma which they themselves hold, for which they most vehemently contend, and the defence of which they so rapturously applaud, this doctrinal champion of the "Gospel Standard" has signaled to all eternity his fame by proving, that the Eternal Father who sent the Son, the Eternal Son who preached repentance and faith to the unconverted, the divinely inspired Apostles who followed the Son's example, and the Eternal Spirit who to that end anointed both the soul of the Son and those of the elect Apostles, were each and all wretched tools in the hands of another; agents circumvented by the guile of a wiser; instruments in their own despite overreached, and subordinated to the purpose and malice of hell. That is, the august and infinite wisdom of the Divine Persons choosing—the minds and most holy anointing of the Elect Agents executing this gracious work of preaching repentance and faith to the unconverted—were things which together constituted the thin end of an infernal wedge; which wedge, with express view to split up the spiritual health of the sanctified people—in the words of our scribe, carnalize and effectually ruin the blood-redeemed Church—had by Satan been prepared and applied. *That* malicious fiend, with a malignity, a cunning, and a success

of which his wretched confederates of the pit may well eternally boast and be glad, having first so confounded the light of the Divine Mind as to cause it to believe fraudulent preaching to be just; and secondly, after having thus deceived the Infinite God himself, next added insult to injury, by making use of the lips of His Eternal Son, those also of all His inspired Apostles, as a means by which to propagate this foul fraud of his insidious preparation. How long, I submit, are the hundred thousand of the P. R. Baptist Churches prepared to feed upon stuff, reprehensible, nay! rank and blasphemous as this? How long will they be content to see THIS EXECRABLE IDOL OF SIN-MARRED REASON, under that convenient but vain plea, to wit, "*championship of revealed truth,*" IN THE PLACE OF ETERNAL WISDOM EXALTED?

But this very edifying writer, in the infatuation of a mind too inflated by far to pause, too superficial by a mighty hand to enquire or ponder, once more upon the victims whom he has no intention to pity or to spare, proceeds to shed forth, under outcry of light, the thick gloom of his rationalistic darkness. Hear yet again, every man, every woman professing edification through instrumentality such as this: for thus in addition saith your doctrinal instructor. "If these addresses (that is, apostolic addresses to the unconverted masses) *are right*, let us at once say, 'A confederacy,' and own too, that we have been wrong, and diminished the truth of God; that the subject of this Memoir (to wit, Mr. Philpot) *was misled*, and has been *misleading us*, and that we are now brought back into harmony with what we thought the fleshly general religion of the day. *But if these universal addresses ARE WRONG*, let us stand by one another in the rejection of them, and not blame the watch-dog, who, perhaps contrary to the ordinary rules of the family, and to the annoyance of the slumbering portion of the household, *and certainly of THE ROBBERS who would break in*, faithfully gives the note of warning." (p. 515.) Let the ingenuous reader in following me through this last extract, take special note of the sentences which by means of diverse type I have selected and set apart for consideration: remembering at the same time against what they are directed, to wit, *the preaching of repentance and faith to the unconverted*. Having done which, let him first of all set over against those highly iniquitous sentences, the noble testimony with respect to his own practice as by Paul delivered to the elders of the church of Ephesus: to wit,—“I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you, but have shewed you, and have taught you publicly, and from house to house, *testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks*, REPENTANCE TOWARD GOD, AND FAITH IN OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST:” and secondly, in juxtaposition with the

said disgraceful sentences, let him further place the record of Mark with regard the practice of the Son of God,—“Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee, *preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God*, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand : **REPENT YE, AND BELIEVE THE GOSPEL.**” Having thus placed side by side the infamous passages of the blaspheming scribe of the “Gospel Standard,” and the inspired record with regard to the daily practice of the Son of God and great Apostle of the Gentiles, let every candid enquirer plainly say, whether or not this highly contumacious author has not in effect pronounced the Incarnate Deity himself, and His noble servant the peerless Paul—that inspired Writer of the greatest and far deepest portions of the New Testament—to be *not merely* THE DIREST ENEMIES *to the spiritual prosperity of the Church of God, but* PROFANE ROBBERS? beings whose whole aim, whose continual practice was, to do violence to the high principle of eternal truth; to carnalize and ruin the primitive Churches; ay! and as much as in their not very stinted measure of power lay, work injury to the doctrines of divine grace,—deep wrong to the heirs of salvation.

Thus much for the blasphemous substance (I forbear positively to say intention) of the disgraceful Article, with which I have here as it deserved sternly dealt. Yet this repulsive specimen of Christ-insulting literature winds up, as might of course have been anticipated, *piously*. Listen; for had the reference not been to the odious trash on which in the foregoing pages I have laid arresting hand, *this*, unquestionably, would have been the best part of our crude author’s lucubration: he says, “May the blessing of God rest upon what has been written, and the dear children of God accept with consideration and forbearing love our attempt in this Review to serve and benefit them.” (p. 516.) A goodly service, of a truth, I have shown this antiscriptural attempt to be. Could any species of hypocritical cant be more intolerable—more detestably offensive? Might not the indignant Deity well look down, and from His throne amid light inaccessible avouch,—“I saw under the sun the place of judgment, *that wickedness was there*; and the place of righteousness, *that iniquity was there*. I said in mine heart, God SHALL JUDGE the righteous and the wicked.” (Eccl. iii. 16, 17.) And again, in the words of Agur to Ithiel might He not with deep reason exclaim,—“Every word of God is pure: he is a shield unto them that put their trust in him. *Add thou NOT UNTO HIS WORDS, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found A LIAR.*” (Prov. xxx. 5, 6.)

SECTION THIRD.

THE FINAL SENTIMENT OF MR. PHILPOT, WITH RESPECT TO THE OBLIGATION OF SETTING FORTH CHRIST AS THE EXTERNAL OBJECT OF FAITH, EXHIBITED: AND THAT SENTIMENT SHEWN TO BE, THE SIMPLE RECURRENCE OF AN ORIGINAL CONVICTION.

WERE any competent party sufficiently interested to undertake the task, it would not I affirm be at all difficult to prove, that had the earthly career of Mr. Philpot been by but a few years extended, he must through a constantly increasing pressure of conscience have been brought into open collision with those Churches, *in* which for five and thirty years he had been a teacher, and *of* which during almost the whole of that time he had been the recognized leader.

If it be asked, upon what ground I have taken upon me thus to predicate, I reply,—Because, by continually augmenting bodily infirmity to a considerable degree solemnized, he was daily becoming more and more alive to the imperial claims of the Divine Word; and through the mercy of God, more and more deeply convinced of the wrong of his unhallowed departures from that just way of teaching, which had from the beginning by Infinite Wisdom been appointed. And by infallible consequence, was at the imperative instances of a continually increasing tenderness of conscience, steadily driven upon that original ground which he had occupied prior to the year 1835: epoch, from which, may be dated all that sad divergence to which I have adverted. Thus, in sending forth in 1865 his “Meditations on the Preceptory Portion of God’s Word,” he not only admits and publicly condemns the unrighteous neglect in this department which throughout the whole course of his labour in the P. R. Baptist Churches had characterized his personal ministration, but that of the preachers generally. While at the same time, by that more practical contending for the fruits of divine grace, which as the legitimate effect of this revived scripturalness of sentiment now began to adorn the few remaining years of his own earthly testimony, not only did he become a powerful instrument to rebuke the continued neglect of his ministerial brethren in this department of the divine will, but an equally powerful witness against that universal censoriousness, that unscriptural bitterness, with which in days past his own ministrations and those of his fellows had been absolutely saturated. In like manner, the late years of this learned gentleman’s epistolary writings, by noble contrast with the spiritual pride, intense egotism, indiscriminate exalting of *self-experience* and self-religion, contempt of scriptural teaching

and sanction, wholesale cynicism, judging, and evil speaking, which so repulsively deform the correspondence of the former years, is a still further plain condemnation both in his own case and that of his fellow-labourers, of the proud spirit which did once—even more than at the period in which Mr. Philpot wrote—utterly reign in the Churches; that spirit, I mean, which never slacked, never wearied in exalting GREAT I; that is, the personal state and experiences of FLESHLY SELF, as the sole standard of a genuine Christianity; while at the same time it was equally indefatigable in judging, traducing, and making it the very business of the sanctuary and of life, proudly to sneer at all others. So likewise, in a precisely similar way, that sentiment of Mr. Philpot's inmost soul which I am now about to adduce, is not merely a tacit condemnation, but though privately enunciated yet positive protest against that system of dealing in the weighty matter of faith, which continues to be the rule in the P. R. Baptist Churches; system in the confirming, if not establishing of which, this gifted man had himself beyond most of his fellows been the leading instrument.

Had space admitted, I doubt not that it would have proved both interesting and instructive, to enquire into the cause of that soul-revulsion from long continued disobedience, that gradual but steady return to original principles, which so decisively marked the close of Mr. Philpot's Christian career. But since my space will not admit, let it suffice to say, that through lapse of time the learned gentleman had had ample leisure to prove, the inefficacy of personal boasting, of indiscriminate traducement of others, and of rationalistic deriding of the divine will, either to give respect in his own sight, or bring spiritual health, with access, at the throne of the holy Jehovah. - He had discovered, albeit late, that self-com mendation of his own state and experience, and unhallowed *sneering at Bible religion*, left him still like one groping—vainly groping for the wall; STILL WITHOUT ANY NOBLE, ANY SENSIBLE ENLARGEMENT IN SPIRITUAL UNION AND COMMUNION WITH GOD. In short, finally, (yea! and in absolute defiance of personal admiration of his *own* experience), he found the adamant nature of that truth which at the lips of the Eternal Son had been revealed: to wit,—*If a man love me he will KEEP MY WORDS: and my Father will love him, AND WE WILL COME UNTO HIM, AND MAKE OUR ABODE WITH HIM.*" (Jo. xiv. 23.) Of which statement the negative but emphatic declaration is, *that Jehovah WILL NOT manifest Himself to THE DISOBEDIENT.* I say the learned *divine* lived to find this out: and by dearly bought experience *discovering* it more and more, was with increasing force, the ever *augmenting* rebuff of a condemnatory conscience, DRIVEN BACK

UPON EARLY PRINCIPLES—EVEN THE GOOD OLD PATHS OF JEHOVAH.

But I may not tarry : hence forthwith proceed to say, that the final, or close-of-life sentiment which from the inmost soul of Mr. Philpot I am now about to adduce, (to wit, with regard to the obligation of setting forth Christ as the external object or rock *upon which by faith the contrite in heart are called to hang*), fell under my observation while in the act of examining that highly reprehensible Article, upon the more objectionable passages of which I have in Section Second of this Appendix so justly commented. In that Article however, a single sentence only from the pen of Mr. Philpot was given : the remainder, *for its very nature's sake*, was strictly reserved—kept back—suppressed. While at the same time, a disingenuous and palpably absurd apology on behalf of the whole, (manifestly with intent to allay any indignation which might by the more intelligent subscribers to the "Gospel Standard" have been felt), was artfully concocted and very faithlessly submitted. This fact is so singular, so altogether of a character to excite suspicion, that before citing evidence to that secret sentiment of Mr. Philpot with which I shall here have to deal, it is necessary for a brief moment to pause and enquire,—WHY THIS APOLOGY ?

The reason, as from the terms employed in the opening passage of the apologist may at a single glance be seen, is, late discovery through the published correspondence of Mr. Philpot, of most startling inconsistency—inconsistency level to the capacity of the very shallowest observer—between the absolute conviction latent in the learned gentleman's mind, and his public and universally understood practice. The apology opens as follows : "Some may see in these remarks" (*to wit, of Mr. Philpot concerning the preaching of Christ as the external object of faith*) an INCONSISTENCY WITH, and CONDEMNATION OF, *the declarations of earlier days :*" that is, not his early days of labour in the Episcopal Church, but earlier or former years in the P. R. Baptist denomination. What then I ask have we here ? Is it not positive evidence to the fact, that both in their spirit and substance those remarks of Mr. Philpot which now forthwith I am about to adduce, were so openly, so palpably at variance with the well known tenor of the Rev. gentleman's ordinary and invariable teaching, that on their public appearance in a series of posthumous letters published by his affectionate widow, the most natural thing as a consequence to be from his exasperated followers expected was, *a universal outburst of intense indignation*. Because of this naturally to be expected result, the time-serving Reviewer employed by the "Gospel Standard" to take notice of

the publication, (*evidently a party thoroughly conversant with THE UNVARYING STRAIN of Mr. Philpot's pulpit ministrations*), in proportion to the no small measure of consternation which through discovery of this secret inconsistency of his great but incomprehensible master he himself could not but painfully experience, felt it (as well he might !) absolutely indispensable to apologize to the Churches for the existence of doctrinal sentiment in their exalted leader and guide, which even to the end of his ministry, albeit protracted five years beyond the date of the extract which I shall immediately record, nobody ever once remembered to have heard enforced by his lip. This last utterly humbling fact, together with that of the Reviewer's unadvised and most faithless apology, naturally had for their effect to arrest my attention. Of which the consequence in due season was, that I borrowed of the party who had been the Lord's instrument to place the unhallowed Article vindicatory of Mr. Philpot in my hand, a copy of the volume of that learned gentleman's published correspondence. And by careful comparison of the letter from which the extract had been quoted, with the few which remain from that period of their author's ministerial life which was passed in the Church of England, I very speedily discerned, that that secret sentiment with respect to faith, for the after-death discovery of which the temporizing Reviewer of the "Gospel Standard" had felt it so absolutely necessary to apologize, but which Mr. Philpot candidly declares "*he had LONG seen and felt,*" was, in fact, neither more nor less than that original sentiment, with which at the commencement of his ministerial career he had set out. *I candidly confess, that this EXTRAORDINARY DISCOVERY did not a little tend to HUMBLE AND ASTONISH ME.*

The extract in full from the letter of Mr. Philpot, one small part only of which was by the Reviewer of the "Gospel Standard" exhibited, I shall now—emphasizing its important clauses by the use of diverse type—proceed word for word to record. It was penned by Mr. Philpot early in 1864, the twenty-ninth year of his ministry in the P. R. Baptist Churches, thirty-sixth from the commencement of his public labour in the Church of England, and about five years and nine months before his death. The remarkable record runs thus.

THE EXTRACT TO BE CONSIDERED.

"I was much pleased with what you (his noble friend Mr. Tanner of Cirencester) said about having your mind more **FIXED UPON OUR BLESSED LORD**, as having died and risen from the dead, and gone up on high. *I have long SEEN and FELT that our faith, if it is to work by love and purify the heart, MUST HAVE*

AN OBJECT—a divine and heavenly object—to whom it CAN LOOK, on whom it CAN HANG, and with whom it may HAVE TO DO. There is a great tendency in the mind, and one, I must add, (he here speaks with exclusive reference to the preachers of the P. R. Baptist Churches), often encouraged by the ministry of the day, *to look too much to our evidences* INSTEAD of *looking to Christ*. IT IS A DELICATE SUBJECT TO HANDLE, and I should much like to talk it over with you in the fear of the Lord, and in that exercise of our enlightened judgment and spiritual experience which makes conversation profitable; and I believe we should see eye to eye in these matters, we should not differ nor dispute. The great difficulty is *to avoid getting on one* WRONG GROUND *in our anxiety* TO GET OFF ANOTHER. . . . But then, on the other hand, there may be an error in leading the poor child of God *to look too much to the work within* INSTEAD of *the work without*, AND MAKE HIS FEELINGS HIS CHRIST. Now we know that all our hope centres in the blood and righteousness of the Son of God, *and we know that* OUR FAITH, *if it bring any peace or consolation*, ONLY DOES SO WHEN IT RECEIVES THE SON OF GOD AS OF GOD MADE UNTO US WISDOM, AND RIGHTEOUSNESS, AND SANCTIFICATION, AND REDEMPTION. *To take Christ out of sight is like substituting a lucifer match for the light of day*. What we want is for the blessed Lord to come into our souls in His dying love, in His risen power, in His free, rich, superabounding grace, in the manifestations of His glorious person, and in the sweet assurance that He loved us and gave himself for us. This is the doctrine—the heavenly doctrine which Paul preached, and which he prayed that the saints might enjoy (Ephesians i. 12—23; iii. 8—21), and this was his own experience. (Gal. ii. 19, 20.) Though so deeply favoured and so highly blessed *he* (Paul) *was not looking to, nor leaning upon*, HIS OWN EXPERIENCE, *even though he had been in the third heaven*, BUT WAS LOOKING TO, AND LEANING UPON, HIS BLESSED LORD. *How this shines, as with a ray of light*, THROUGH HIS BLESSED EPISTLES, and oh, that we might be taught by the same Spirit, have the same in measure, experience, AND PREACH TO OTHERS THE SAME GLORIOUS GOSPEL, *holding forth the word of life that we may rejoice in the day of Christ that we have not run in vain, neither laboured in vain*.” (Letter No. 185: to Mr. Tanner).

This letter, substantially considered, so utterly condemnatory of the one-sidedness of its author's personal ministration, bears upon its face the fact, that that which Mr. Philpot both *saw* and *felt*, yea! and of which in heart he was absolutely *convinced*, he dared not even to breathe in public: nay! scarcely under frequent hints at the confidential nature of the communication, to his ex-

cellent and honourable friend Joseph Tanner. This is the key to that mysterious clause,—*"It is a delicate subject to handle,"* clause which, like some haunted castle from the midst of a lake, shrouding within its barred portal a perfect world of terror, lowers ominously through the midnight mist upon the startled beholder.

For the above extraordinary unfaithfulness of Mr. Philpot, the incomprehensible apology of his time-serving Reviewer is as follows. "Some may see in these remarks an INCONSISTENCY WITH, and CONDEMNATION OF, the declarations of earlier days; we rather discern the RIPENING OF THE MIND IN THE TRUTH OF GOD, and the youth of Christianity passing on into the MELLOWNESS OF AGE" (G. S. Dec. 1871, p. 513.) Having delivered himself of this not merely absurd, but as far as Mr. Philpot is concerned, doubly, nay! trebly confounding explanation, this very candid Reviewer next, by artfully leading the attention of his readers to a totally different subject, to wit, early and later experiences, sets himself to evade the one, the exclusive point at issue. But unhappily for him, there is no matter of experience here involved: for the whole question amounts to this,—*Is Christ indeed the EXTERNAL OBJECT to which faith is required to have respect; and if He BE, is He in that blessed character to be preached? Or contrariwise, to the neglect of such exhibition of Christ as the rock of faith, is inward feeling ALONE to be preached, and thus EXALTED INTO THE DIVINE SAVIOUR'S VERY PLACE?*

Having now set forth the incomprehensible nature of that excuse, shift, juggle, by which, at the expense of divine truth, a faithless Reviewer would veil this late discovered existence in the heart of his master of doctrinal sentiment wholly at variance with the general tenor of his ministrations, I here affirm, and shall forthwith proceed to prove, that that justification of an erring master at which the greatly conscientious scholar too manifestly but most impotently aims, so far from having the effect intended, does only in the very highest avail to heap up condemnation. For were the excuse by this disingenuous apologist suggested actually true, then, of a certainty, it renders the subsequent silence of his master not merely doubly, but a million-fold more blameworthy—more hopelessly unjustifiable—than if no such ignominious apology had ever been offered.

Keeping then in view the naked fact, that the question under consideration has no reference whatever to experience, but to THE OBJECT OR DIVINE ROCK OF FAITH, which Rock is not personal feeling but the crucified Christ; let it next very diligently be enquired, what the value of that apology really is, which to cover the ministerial inconsistency of his master has by this too juggling Reviewer been propounded? Is it not in plain

words here affirmed, that the views of divine truth latent or secret in that master's heart, but which throughout the whole course of an exceedingly protracted ministry no mortal ear ever heard from his lips, *were the result of a RIPENED STATE of the gifted man's mind in the truth of God, and the effect of a MELLOWED, A MATURED Christianity?* If so, then be the question asked, *What was this more matured view of divine truth for which, as peculiar to his master's mind, the halting apology of the pupil is offered?* Simply this,—That as *the divinely appointed sacrifice for sin, or adamant rock upon which the faith of the contrite may safely rest,* THE LORD JESUS CHRIST OUGHT TO BE PREACHED, *and not mere personal feeling.* Of a truth, an exceedingly momentous—exceedingly scriptural—exceedingly incontrovertible and excellent conclusion. If then faith, must as Mr. Philpot avers have *an object* on which to rest, and not rest on passing and ephemeral *feeling*—and if that object on which faith should rest be the Lord Jesus Christ—and if as the apostle Paul has affirmed, such “*faith cometh by hearing*”—then, even in the very earliest stage of Mr. Philpot's ministration in the P. R. Baptist Churches, this ought to have been set forth. But, alas! it was *not*: our Reviewer himself being witness, it was NOT. Then great, unquestionably great, the blame attaching to the neglect. Notwithstanding which, it might still according to that charity which justifies man rather than God have been by an admirer pleaded,—‘Nay! for Mr. Philpot *could not* at the time have known this: he *must* during his earlier years have been utterly ignorant with respect to it; *must* have failed to preach Christ as the external object on which faith *may* and *should* rely, simply because he had not for himself discovered that pre-eminently plain truth of the New Testament.’ Well, marvelling much at the learned gentleman's Christian ignorance, we might under the above strenuously urged plea, feel disposed to grant him the full benefit of the doubt, and impute his neglect in this matter to sheer spiritual darkness. But what shall we say when at a much later period of life, this illustrious man with his own pen gives us to understand—“*that he had LONG SEEN AND FELT that faith must have AN OBJECT—a divine and heavenly OBJECT—to whom it CAN LOOK, on whom it MAY HANG, and with whom it may HAVE TO DO?*” What shall we say now? Surely the very least that under knowledge of these improved circumstances may be said, is this: Well, since at length Mr. Philpot plainly perceived, deeply felt, was to the core of his heart thoroughly convinced, that in order to those actings of faith described in Scripture as a—“LOOKING UNTO”—“BELIEVING ON”—“HOLDING FAST”—“TRUSTING IN”—“AND CONSIDERING”—there must positively be an external object, the

divine object Jesus Christ, the very least which as late reparation for the former years of neglect he ought now to have done, *was, plainly, vehemently, and incessantly to preach it.* But—alas! alas! the learned gentleman himself substantially bears witness, that he was *afraid*: hence—preached it NOT. Then the former excuse being under these improved circumstances no longer available, great, unquestionably great, the righteous censure accruing to the neglect. But in face of this deeply solemn fact, what shall be judged or thought, when the temporising Reviewer whom I make manifest, with design to veil the eyes of all whom he is so deeply interested to beguile, consequentially gives us to understand, that the grand fact which his master secretly acknowledged that he saw, yea! felt, yea! thoroughly appreciated yet preached NOT, was by that master thus plainly apprehended, not through the ordinary, crude, inexperienced, seeing and feeling and conviction of a spiritual babe, *but the seeing, the feeling, the conviction, of a mind thoroughly RIPENED IN DIVINE TRUTH; a mind which from the inexperience of youth, had passed into THE MELLOWNESS OR FULL MATURITY OF CHRISTIANITY?* What, I submit, shall we say now? With indignation for the neglect of Mr. Philpot never to be repressed, it must unquestionably be retorted thus. ‘That if under the simply improved circumstance of *seeing and feeling the necessity* in question, this learned gentleman as one having assumed the responsibility of the ministry was SEVEN TIMES OVER debtor to Jehovah to preach the grand truth in question, then, certainly under the latter circumstance, to wit, *of a mind fully ripened in divine truth—the subject of a thoroughly mellowed or matured Christianity*—SEVENTY TIMES SEVEN. But regardless of this high obligation, the learned gentleman whom our Reviewer would fain justify—despite those transcendent advantages as a teacher with which by virtue of this matured estate he stood endowed, continued to preach as the very parties whom he had condemned; yea! kept all that ripe knowledge, that more mellow and mature Christian understanding here ascribed to him, deeply buried in the profounds of his own heart; and through sheer lack of courage to breathe a syllable of his secret in public, went down in due course to the grave, and preached it NOT. No wonder then that this cautious, this artfully balancing Reviewer should very painfully forebode, that the posthumous evidence of this fact coming down like a thunderbolt on the hearts and minds of his master’s disciples, should not merely establish distrust of the system itself, but raise a shout against the *inconsistency* of the party so incessantly quoted as an authority in its defence. No wonder because of the ministerial unfaithfulness to

which I point, the highly principled Reviewer should with a pungency altogether painful perceive, how instant the need of that veil, covering cloak, (call it by whatever name you will), supplied by his absurd—his most unrighteous apology.

But since to his intimate friend Joseph Tanner the excellent Mr. Philpot secretly admits, "I have LONG seen and felt that our faith, if it is to work by love and purify the heart, *must* have an object—a divine and heavenly object—to whom it *can* look, on whom it *can* hang, and with whom it may *have* to do," therefore, with design to confute their guile who to veil fact and deceive the ignorant, would ascribe this view of Mr. Philpot to the ripening of his mind in divine truth and the mellowness of a more matured Christianity, I at this point see fit to demand, Since by the learned gentleman himself it is to Mr. Tanner very plainly admitted, 'that he had LONG seen, felt, and been thoroughly convinced of the truth which even in secret he scarce dared to avow, therefore, *how long—what number of years had this been the case.*' Through indisputable evidence, as in the volume of correspondence before me legibly recorded, I am enabled very plainly to reply, From before that day (twenty-nine years earlier than this epistle to Mr. Tanner) on which the learned gentleman cast in his lot with the P. R. Baptist Churches. For proof of which fact, I turn to certain letters addressed to a Mrs. Rackham, and dated so far back as 1831 : in which I find that identical *teaching*, which in confidence to Joseph Tanner in 1864 had by this gifted man been so strongly commended. He says, "I trust, during the season that has past since I saw you, *that you have been enabled TO TRUST IN HIM, who of God is made unto us wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption.* I hope the Lord has shown you more and more of His cleansing blood and justifying righteousness, *and given you FAITH TO LOOK AT THE ONE AND LAY HOLD OF THE OTHER.* To feel our deep need of forgiveness and reconciliation is God's gift ; to see that there is a Saviour provided, who by His life and death put away sin and brought in everlasting righteousness, is God's gift ; *to LAY HOLD OF and BELIEVE ON THIS SAVIOUR,* so precisely suited to our lost and condemned state, is God's gift." (p. 26.) Again in the same letter, "that we may have the truth, as it is in Jesus, applied with power and the Holy Ghost and much assurance, *and that we may have an experimental, divine FAITH IN THE PERSON AND WORK OF THE SON OF GOD wrought in our souls.*" (p. 27.) Yet again in the same letter, "In your conversations with Mr. B. I would have you avoid all disputes about election and such doctrines, and speak rather of such subjects as our natural sinfulness and condemnation, the necessity of *having Christ for our perfect*

aviour, the efficacy of His blood and His blood alone, *and the need of EMBRACING THIS BY FAITH.*" (p. 28.) Here is apostolic and scriptural teaching: this Mr. B. was an unregenerate man, or in other words, a sinner. Blessed therefore be God, for Mr. Philpot's apostolic beginnings in the ministry. But again, in the second published letter addressed to the same party, and in the same year, I find this further evidence. "I am afraid the children of God have been looking in times past too much to the instrument, *and not LOOKING SIMPLY TO CHRIST that they might be filled out of the fulness that is laid up in Him.*" And yet again from the same letter,—*"Remember you are a poor sinner who can only be saved by Jesus, and that the promise is given to those THAT BELIEVE IN HIM that they shall be saved. CLEAVE SIMPLY TO THIS, that His blood cleanseth from all sin, and LET NOTHING DRIVE YOU FROM THAT."*

Should the above records be deemed insufficient to establish the point in question, let the reader once more turn to that extract which from the "Memoir of William Tiptaft" I have given on p. 76; but especially the passage,—*"Enabling me to show in whom were stored our righteousness and strength, and that both were in Christ, and neither of them in ourselves."* Let this be compared with all the exhortation to Mrs. Rackham with respect to BELIEVING ON, TRUSTING IN, CLEAVING UNRESERVEDLY TO, CHRIST AS THE SOLE OBJECT OF FAITH, and see how abundantly the sad case which I am establishing will stand proved. But I have now furnished superabounding evidence to the fact, that that scriptural, that divinely appointed practice the value of which in his letter to Joseph Tanner in 1864 Mr. Philpot admits he had LONG seen, felt, and appreciated, to wit, of setting forth Christ as the external object or rock upon which by faith to rest, was by this learned gentleman certainly apprehended, known, understood, at least as far back as the year 1831. Notwithstanding which, through that stupendous barrier which by force especially of his own condemnation of that way during twenty-nine years had throughout the P. R. Baptist Churches been raised up, (the prejudices I mean of his own contrarily-taught followers), despite his inward feelings, throes, convictions, experiences, et cætera, he might not dare in his last years to preach it. Yea! apostolic, Christ-like, scriptural though he well knew the first way to be, yet scarcely to his honoured friend Joseph Tanner, did he venture (with express hints as to the secret nature of the communication) to breathe it. IT HAD, FORSOOTH! BECOME A DELICATE SUBJECT TO HANDLE."

In full view therefore of this alleged delicacy of the subject—or, to be plain, this impossibility of preaching in the P. R.

Baptist Churches the Lord Jesus Christ as the *object* or *rock* upon which by faith every contrite spirit is called to hang—I *would*, had that eminent man been yet living, have put it to Mr. Philpot himself, and to all his professed admirers I here *do* most expressly put it, Was it indeed in the sight of the Lord Jesus Christ, or that of His elect and inspired Apostles a thing so exceedingly difficult or delicate to handle,—*this preaching of Christ as the rock of faith?* Did the Son of God on the last day, that great day of the feast, stand forth amid the crowds of miscellaneous knaves, hypocrites, villains that thronged the streets of Jerusalem and vehemently cry,—“If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. *He that believeth on me*, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water:” or did Peter when he testified to Cornelius,—“To him (Christ) give all the prophets witness, that through his name *whosoever believeth in him* shall receive remission of sins:” or did Paul, when at Antioch he cried in the ears of all in the synagogue,—“Be it known unto you therefore, men and brethren, that through this man (Jesus Christ) is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and by him *all that believe are justified from all things*, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses:” and again in the ears of the Philippian jailor,—“*Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved:*” did these, or any of them, I ask, in thus preaching to the hearts of the contrite the Son of God as the object of faith—find the subject so wondrously, so mysteriously delicate to handle? But if not, then, the question immediately occurs, yea! will in one’s despite press in upon the mind, to wit, —Why with the Divine Exemplar and inspired Apostles full before his eyes, should the learned Joseph Charles Philpot? For the reason, I aver, already very plainly recorded: that is, because by his own long continued preaching against that way—the condemnation with which he and his brethren had openly visited all who *did* as the external object of faith preach Christ—he and they, had throughout their own Churches effectually succeeded in bringing that divine practice into contempt. In a word, they had raised up followers by the thousand, who esteemed as love of truth the disgraceful act of branding this preaching of *faith in a divine object*, to wit, the Lord Jesus Christ, PURE ARMINIANISM; the preachers of it, without distinction and without difference, as DUTY-FAITH, OR WILL-FAITH PREACHERS. Of which state of things the consequence was, that Mr. Philpot well knew, that had he through the preaching of faith in Christ honestly carried out that which he saw, felt, knew, yea! had long thoroughly judged to be right, he must infallibly have reaped the fruit of his own devices; must have been content to see himself branded

as a duty-faith preacher, and an arrant Arminian. *Hence to him, and to all his unscriptural coadjutors it had indeed become, "A HIGHLY DELICATE SUBJECT TO HANDLE."*

I desire however in closing this supplementary note, publicly to express my admiration of the great wisdom of Jehovah, who through not merely convincing Mr. Philpot on this point and causing that conviction to be recorded, but making use of the affection of his bereaved widow to search up that record and cause it to be published, has on this point also, to wit, the duty of preaching Christ as the external object or rock of faith—albeit at great cost to the reputation of His distinguished servant for consistency—deemed meet to strengthen my weak but unwavering hand. For here in opposition to the practice of the ministry in the P. R. Baptist Churches, is the plain though throughout life carefully concealed evidence, *that in heart notwithstanding his tongue was silent Mr. Philpot both knew and admitted, THAT A FAITHFUL EXHIBITION OF CHRIST AS THE EXTERNAL OBJECT TO BE BY FAITH SEIZED OR APPREHENDED—NOR THUS SEIZED AND APPREHENDED ONLY, BUT IN LIKE MANNER EVER-LASTINGLY BEHELD AND TRUSTED IN—was the plain command of the Scriptures, the clearly revealed will of the sovereign Jehovah.*

But to conclude. With immediate reference to that unfilial neglect, which in his letter to Joseph Tanner Mr. Philpot so decidedly condemns, to wit, of NOT thus preaching Christ as a rock upon which the faith of the contrite is called to rest—practice through which, is the all-but neutralizing of spiritual strength, all-but sacrificing of that sanctification predestined to gospel faith—practice of which the sad effect is, to cast men entirely upon trust in their own frames and feelings, until virtually these varying frames are not only exalted above the Person, but inducted into the very throne and office of Christ—*Who, I ask, to anything like the same extent as the learned gentleman himself, ever thrust upon the P. R. Baptist Churches that wrong?* I believe the presumption will be found correct, when I declare it to be my firm conviction, that throughout the whole thirty-four years of this gifted individual's ministration in the P. R. Baptist Churches, no mortal ear ever once heard him preach home to the anxious heart of an awakened sinner the preaching of Paul,—*"BELIEVE on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved."* He had reduced that improved state of things gradually obtaining since the days of William Huntington, to far too strait a system for that. Hence, if for one solitary instance of the plain evangelical teaching of Paul, the whole mass of this learned gentleman's printed sermons should be searched, I believe the quest would prove utterly in vain. While in place of such apostolic teaching would be found,

very much attempt AT COMFORTING UPON CONVICTION WITHOUT RESPECT TO FAITH ; and through a far too confident pronouncing upon seemingly hopeful evidences, THE STITCHING OF PILLOWS TO THE ARM-HOLES OF TENS OF THOUSANDS.

But here, I doubt not, we shall through the false god Reason once more be assailed with the cry, "Is it not written, that faith is not of yourselves,—that it is the gift of God? What then is the use of preaching to the distress of the anxious faith in Christ, when that gift is not in their own power, but suspended entirely upon the will of the sovereign Jehovah? To which absurd rationalistic cavil I reply, *All* gospel blessings without exception, are dependent on the mere free favour of God : what then is the use of preaching anything? But wilt thou know, O vain man, that it is written again,—“The just *shall live* by his faith:” (Hab. ii. 4.): “I said not unto the seed of Jacob, Seek ye me in vain:” (Is. xlv. 16): “He shall receive the blessing from the Lord, and righteousness (*that is, the righteousness which is by faith*) from the God of his salvation. This is the generation of them that seek him, that seek thy face, O God of Jacob:” (Ps. xxiv. 5, 6.): “For every one that asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened.” (Matt. vii. 8.) GO THOU, THEREFORE, AND PREACH TO THE CHILDREN OF MEN THE PREACHING THAT I BADE THEE.” (Jonah iii. 2.)

SECTION FOURTH.

NOTES ON A SECOND HIGHLY REPREHENSIBLE ARTICLE, BY SOME ANONYMOUS WRITER PUBLISHED IN THE MAGAZINE CALLED “GOSPEL STANDARD,” IN THE MONTH OF MAY, 1873.

IF memory serve me faithfully, it was after the painful trial recorded in my Introduction—that controversy which by reason of the grinding nature of the first draught of this Treatise the Lord saw fit to hold with me—and while I was engaged in the arduous work of breaking up, softening down, purging out, and curtailing, that a gentleman of the P. R. Baptist denomination, but a firm advocate for the whole counsel of God as revealed in Scripture, called on me; and placing the Article which I shall here examine in my hand, gave me to understand, that the authorship of the book upon which it expressly comments, (an allegorical work entitled “The Road to Destruction”), was by report everywhere imputed to me. At my leisure, I glanced through the said Article, and had no difficulty in perceiving with what intent the book reviewed had been ascribed to myself. The thought also found place in my mind, that the writer, whoever

he might be, was probably the same from whom a year and six months previously had emanated, the preceding Article so justly branded in this Appendix. I proceed to deal with the traitorous production.

Observe then, first, that because of a certain spirit of inquiry, which through my own ministration of the Word had in the P. R. Baptist Churches begun to be awakened, the writer of the Article now to be considered, manifestly with design to soothe and mislead his readers, boldly predicates on behalf of these Churches **THAT VERY POSITION**, which it is the peculiar province of this Treatise to defend; to wit, that the indiscriminate preaching of the gospel to sinners, or, preaching of the gospel to the unconverted after the manner of Christ and the inspired Apostles, *is* the established custom—**THE RULE**. Follow therefore I beseech thee, O reader, and while with faithful hand I unmask it, note thou the premeditated, the intentional guile, of this doctrinal scribe of the "Gospel Standard." And when you *have* marked, then, if indeed you know anything at all of the daily practice in the High Calvinistic Baptist Churches, the cherished boast of their preachers and members, judge of the very low esteem in which this self-constituted director of evangelical sentiment has held the august entities of truth and righteousness. The party here substituting personal mendacity for fact, his own deceit in place of universal opinion and practice, proceeds thus barefacedly to deliver himself. "*First, as it respects the preaching of the gospel TO ALL MEN INDISCRIMINATELY, according to the commission of the Lord Jesus to his Apostles. (Mark xvi. 15.)* The Strict Baptist Churches have all along had to sustain the slanderous charge of preaching to none but the elect, or to none but saints and believers. . . . Now we venture to say that, whilst the Strict Baptist Churches have from the earliest date rejected on every hand the system of offered grace, and do still, yet it is a libel upon them to *affirm that they have not contended for a free proclamation of THE WHOLE TRUTH AND COUNSEL OF GOD to saint and sinner, to high and low, to rich and poor, to bond and free, and to as many of every class, stamp, and character as are brought in the providence of God under the sound of the gospel.*" (p. 198.)

With respect to this passage, nothing can possibly be more manifest than the fact, that by reason of the spirit of enquiry to which I have referred, the intent of the writer was, by the way of artifice to meet, soothe, and if possible once more lull to sleep, this gradually awakening spirit. For if by any means you can *succeed* in persuading intelligent beings who have begun to be *dissatisfied* about a matter, that already they stand possessed

of the entire substance of that for which they feel disposed to contend, why then, it is to them evident, that contend as they may they can have no more. Under which very soothing reflection, they feel that they may just as well again fold hands, lie down, and fall fast asleep. Hence the above strenuous, and I may justly add, most unprincipled attempt, to ingraft upon the credulity of the whole lay portion of this denomination the notorious falsehood, that the practice of the Lord Jesus Christ,—practice also of His inspired Apostles,—(*practice of preaching indiscriminately to fallen men, wrong doing sinners, repentance toward God and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ*),—is at present current, nay! in days past also, has invariably been the rule in the P. R. Baptist Churches. This calmly premeditated fraud, this jesuitically devised trick, having with the unhallowed design to which I have alluded been adopted, reduced to print, and disseminated, it is incumbent upon me to bring to light the fact, that the writer before us when he planned and penned this unhallowed assertion, knew thoroughly that it was false; knew well, that for the purpose of misleading he intended it to be false; knew perfectly, that provided only it secured the iniquitous end in view, he cared not at whose expense, God's or man's, went forth the hideous falsehood which it contained. I shall therefore as a matter of sacred, judicial obligation, make it my express business before God to convict this highly unscrupulous person, first, out of the mouth of his great master, the Rev. J. C. Philpot; and secondly, with equal clearness out of his own. I shall, I doubt not, on abounding evidence be able to show, that he is not merely an adept to deceive the credulous mass of his too illiterate brethren, but one, who reckless of the grand fact "that light has come into the world, loves darkness rather than light because his deeds are evil."

But before handling the weighty proof, shall I not without aid of evidence confute him, on the consciousness of every member of that denomination which he has laboured so assiduously to deceive? Exalting then the incorruptible consciousness of every recognized minister, every office bearer, every man, woman, girl, and child, into the throne of judgment, I demand of them in the aggregate, Do they not know, are they not sure, could they not vouch it upon oath—that the preaching of the gospel as by God commanded—as by the acts also of the Son of God and His Apostles exemplified—is NOT the rule in the P. R. Baptist Churches: nay, more; is not only *not* the rule, but is throughout their entire circle studiously ignored, wilfully excluded, purposely banished? Do they not know, are they not sure, could they not on oath avouch it, that the abominable statement put forth by this unprincipled writer, this wretched tool of the "*Gospel Standard*," is unadulterated, yea! self-evident falsehood? If it wer

not the deliberate falsehood which they very well *know* it to be—and if according to the mendacious affirmation which it contains *the whole counsel of God WERE CARRIED OUT in the ministry of these Churches*—then, how I submit, could there possibly be a shadow of ground for the massive, the overwhelming demonstrations borne on the pages of this Book? But again, is it not by the incorruptible consciousness of all whom I have inducted into the office of judgment ratified, that the grand boast of their churches is, that they are “CHURCHES OF TRUTH?” a boast which they found upon the fact, that whereas in an indiscriminate preaching of repentance and faith to sinners other denominations follow the example of the Son of God and his Apostles, contrariwise, they, because of the doctrine of election, and sister fact that God through the Spirit works supernatural repentance and faith in the elect, not merely upon alleged principle repudiate that practice, but vehemently and contemptuously denounce as an errorist, every individual with whom such apostolic practice is found. Again, is it not by the incorruptible consciousness of all whom in this case I have elected judges, abundantly witnessed, that from their leading sanctuary in London, through my own preaching of the Divine Ultimatum to man, to wit, “REPENTANCE TOWARD GOD, AND FAITH IN CHRIST FOR THE REMISSION OF SIN,”—the whole of the present disgraceful controversy had rise? And is it not to an intention on the part of the great majority in those Churches—now—while even yet I am in the act of recording it—absolutely to exclude from the pulpit all such preaching, that the demonstrations of this Book *do*, as a swift witness on behalf of God against them, go before to the bar of His judgment? Except under immediate condemnation of that incorruptible principle—that consciousness to which in this case I have appealed—can any one of these facts be denied? And if not, then, by universal testimony of the uncompromising psychical faculty in question, is not the gratuitously devised, the recklessly tendered statement of this treacherous scribe of the “Gospel Standard”—proved—demonstrated—perpetually and to the uttermost made manifest—as unadulterated, coldly premeditated falsehood?

But if because of the painful bearing of this appeal upon the ministry and doctrinal predilections of many to whom it is submitted, these or any of them should demur to admit the grand fact which I assert, to wit, *that it is NOT the practice in their Churches to carry out the WHOLE WILL AND COUNSEL OF GOD*, then, I have a still more practical, a yet more effectual way of *dealing* with the case. To every such pastor, every such *occasional* preacher as would seek either to evade or deny my asser-

tion, I take leave very plainly to say, Since you see fit to disallow that which as absolute fact I maintain, therefore, that the justice of your conduct may be proved, let each man of his courtesy arise, and himself give practical proof that the statement which I have here advanced is gratuitous. But how? I answer, By the very simple act, of every man forthwith preaching to the unconverted in the same unrestricted terms as did the Son of God and His Apostles. If they find scope for their testimony, then, I shall be willing to acknowledge that the statement of the party writing in the "Gospel Standard" has now (whatever it might have been before) become a *true* statement. But if, contrariwise, such ministerial parties find *not* sufficient scope for the testimony of the Son of God and His Apostles, then, here in evidence neither to be ignored nor evaded is the absolute proof, that the assertion of the writer whom for the baseness of his statement I arraign, is both utterly and wilfully mendacious. And if it be, then a still further important question arises, and seems imperatively to demand answer: viz., Upon what plea in a periodical professedly religious, an organ claiming to set forth and glorify *the sanctifying power of divine grace in the soul*, is this deliberate propounding on the one hand by writers, this tolerance on the other by editors, of known, nay! self-evident falsehood? Save the following, I profess myself absolutely inadequate to suggest a reason; to wit, Actual existence in the hearts and minds of these parties, of the infamous principle enunciated by the priesthood of Rome; to wit, that the end sanctifies the means; that falsehood loses the natural blackness of her stain and grows exquisitely white, if, only, it occur in the interests of our Mother the Church. Of a truth there is much force in the aphorism, that "*Extremes meet*:" for, lo, here the Ultra-Calvinist of the "Gospel Standard" and the Great Antichrist of the Vatican have met together—the mendacity in this and in that actually kissed each other.

But, that the reckless statement of the party here arraigned, may through the medium of that personal consciousness to which I have appealed still more clearly appear, let the following experimental proof in the development of which I myself was the divinely appointed instrument, be now as before the Lord considered. Little did I dream at the moment, that the whole circumstance at this point to be narrated, had in the wisdom of God been ordained His instrument against that knavery which He would here drag to light: knavery of a mind to which evidently it is but a small thing, to plan and vent unadulterated falsehood.

Observe then, that it is scarcely more than a year past, that I was on the Lord's day occupying the pulpit of a certain Church

of the P. R. Baptist denomination. That Church, happened to be one, which by general voice of the preachers of this body, had for years been extolled beyond many, for spirituality and vital godliness. After the morning service, and pending the hour of the afternoon gathering for prayer, some of the deacons, and others, had come together for spiritual converse and Christian communion. Our thoughts having turned upon the purpose of God in the ministry, I took advantage of the opportunity which I perceived to be presented, and spoke to the following effect. 'We are here to-day, brethren, before God as His professing servants: and with respect to the controversy now raging on the point of the ministry, I have a question which I wish to submit to you. It is this. Supposing that disguised in smock frock as one of the poorest of your lay preachers, or black coat as one of your accredited travelling ministers, the Son of God were to enter any pulpit of the P. R. Baptist Churches and preach in the same terms, the very same spirit as characterized Him when a wanderer upon earth, tell me as in the presence of God, WOULD HE, OR WOULD HE NOT, BE CAST HEADLONG OUT?' Such my question: as might well have been expected, there was a long and painful pause, no man venturing to speak. In consequence, I spoke again. 'I trust that all who are here present are Christian friends—true servants of the Lord Jesus Christ—and faithful witnesses to His Word: and since in the inquiry which I have proposed I have the glory of God at heart, the defence of His truth and righteousness in view, I request that as in His own immediate presence the question may be answered. Under the circumstances named, WOULD THE SON OF GOD HIMSELF BE, OR WOULD HE NOT, WITH CONTEMPT CAST OUT OF THESE CHURCHES?' Again there was an ominous pause, accompanied by uneasy demonstrations. At length, to break the painful silence, one with considerable hesitancy ventured to say, 'that he really feared *it would be the case—that the Lord Jesus Christ would indeed be cast out.*' The ice being thus broken, a second with much more confidence plainly affirmed, 'that as for himself, he had not the *slightest doubt of it—Christ certainly would be cast out.*' There was no longer any holding back; another, and yet another followed; '*they were sure—absolutely certain—THAT IT WOULD BE THE CASE.*' My next simple question was, 'Brethren, ought such to be the state of things in Christ's own Church—are they right?' The answer was, 'Certainly not.' I rejoined, 'Then tell me, is it possible that Jehovah can look down upon a system involving evil such as this, with approbation—and ratify it with the seal of *His blessing.*' It was by every one present at once conceded,—**'THAT HE COULD NOT.'** Such the simple incident: it will,

I believe, without the dissent of a single godly heart, be accounted unutterably sad. Now here is the united testimony of the leading members and office bearers of one of the most spiritual of the Churches in question: which testimony, must of necessity be corroborated by every other church throughout the whole denomination. Notwithstanding which, in that intentionally deceptive Article of the "Gospel Standard" with which I here deal, it is by the highly unscrupulous writer deliberately, yea! by a palpable lie asserted, (I give his own words, exact), that "ACCORDING TO THE COMMISSION OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST, TO ALL MEN INDISCRIMINATELY, THE GOSPEL IS IN THESE CHURCHES PREACHED." From the evidences here furnished, let the reader according to the measure of his gospel light now judge, the contemptibly low esteem in which this self-constituted religious instructor of the P. R. Baptist Churches has held the moral excellencies of truth and righteousness. For myself, I forbear to comment on this sickening display—this sad exhibition of disregard for Christian integrity and manly candour. I but point to it, and pass on: for to all whom the Spirit of God hath sanctified, such things can but be a cause of shame, of humiliation, of deep and never-dying regret.

It is highly necessary, however, that I next as I said, convict this conscientious writer, first, out of his great master's mouth, and secondly, out of his own. With regard to his master, the learned Joseph Charles Philpot, let the reader permit me to recall to mind, that that strange intellectual juggle which occasions these pages, was by the distinguished man in question propounded in justification of a practice, current in the P. R. Baptist Churches at least so far back as the year 1841; and that the same has been the instrument of their justification in that practice to the present time: nay! was in 1872, as the sole authority or standard of appeal in this question, republished, and with very general approbation exalted. Listen then and say, whether as by the writer whose veracity I impeach stated, it at all affords ground for the assertion, (I again quote his own words), that "*a free proclamation of the WHOLE TRUTH AND COUNSEL OF GOD to saint and sinner is the established usage in these Churches?*" Mr. Philpot, without pretence in this place at respecting the whole revealed counsel of God, puts the question,—“Are ministers allowed to employ similar exhortations (that is, to those used by Christ and his Apostles) *now?*” The required NEGATIVE to which highly unwarrantable inquiry he determines to furnish as follows. “Do ministers now stand in that position that their words shall ever become part of the sacred volume? or can they feel that they use them under special inspiration? NO.” Having

thus recklessly obtained his **NEGATIVE**, he next very stupidly argues : " If then they were to use them (that is the same exhortations which were by Christ and his Apostles addressed to sinners) they would do so conscious of their impotency ; and might as well imitate Peter in bidding the lame beggar rise up and walk, *as imitate the Apostles in exhortations* TO REPENT AND BELIEVE THE GOSPEL." Now here word for word is that intellectual juggle which in 1841, for the express purpose of justifying the practice of NOT preaching the gospel as preached by Christ and his Apostles, was by Mr. Philpot invented, published, and throughout the Churches promulgated. The practice therefore of NOT preaching the gospel after the pattern of Christ and his Apostles was in existence prior to 1841 ; was by Mr. Philpot defended in that year ; has remained the established practice ever since ; and by republication of the absurd juggle of Mr. Philpot in 1872, was once more throughout the Churches boldly vindicated. Will the ingenuous reader—the man, the woman, whose soul perceives and is touched by the beauty of truth—be pleased to compare the facts here stated, with that mendacious assertion which from the Article of the " Gospel Standard " under consideration I have quoted ; and when the comparison has carefully been made, will he or she yet further vouchsafe to say, whether the highly principled author of that assertion has not (as I have sternly charged the crime upon him) *deliberately and with full knowledge of his act—LIED.*

Having convicted this false witness out of his master's mouth, I shall next, as I promised, consummate his highly merited conviction out of his own. For this end then be it carefully noted, that he says :—" We believe that God's design, object, and purpose (he means God's *only* design, object, and purpose) in and by the gospel of his Son Jesus Christ, was from the first the calling out of the elect. This is clearly stated in the Acts : ' Simeon hath declared how God at the first did visit the Gentiles, to take out of them a people for his name.' We believe that Christ died for the elect, and for none but the elect (he means, and with *no other purpose*, no evangelical purpose toward the non-elect) ; that he voluntarily took their sins by imputation, and made complete and everlasting atonement for them by the offering up of himself without spot to God ; and that, as the result of such divine satisfaction having been rendered to God,—the sins of the elect having been put away, their persons redeemed, the law honoured, and justice satisfied in their behalf, all and every one must and *shall* be saved ; and a Triune Jehovah will be eternally glorified in their salvation." (p. 200.)

Such the statement of this pre-eminently shallow scribe of the

"Gospel Standard." I take him at his own words: but in thus taking I request the candid reader to remember the mendacious statement with which in his remarks this man sets out: to wit, "That it is a libel on the P. R. Baptist Churches to affirm, that they have not contended for a free proclamation of THE WHOLE TRUTH AND COUNSEL OF GOD, to saint and *sinner*, to high and low, to rich and poor, to bond and free, and to as many of every class, stamp, and character as are brought in the providence of God under the sound of the gospel." (p. 198.) Now here with all premeditation have we the falsehood asserted, that the whole truth and counsel of God is freely proclaimed and contended for in the Churches in question—is preached both TO SAINT AND TO SINNER. Mark therefore, that if as in the immediately foregoing extract we are by this juggling doctrinist given to understand, Christ died for the elect and for them alone, then, that being the case it is clear, *that there is neither in law, nor yet in equity, a vestige of righteous ground, nay! nor the faint shadow of a vestige, on which the P. R. Baptist Churches can cause their ministers to preach the gospel to all men:* there is but ground to cause it to be preached to the elect. If this be true, and to disprove it will be task too hard for the acutest ultra-Calvinist, then, even as in Chapter V., Part Second, of the foregoing Treatise I have abundantly proved, to preach the gospel to any other than the elect would not only be illegal, but to preach A FOUNDATIONLESS LIE; for nothing can be more palpable, more self-evident than the fact, that where there is no righteous foundation for a gospel to sinners, there can with a just God be for such parties no gospel. Notwithstanding which formidable, nay! absolutely insuperable barrier,—in flat contempt moreover of that very peculiarity of practice in which his Churches do incessantly boast themselves,—we have this self-constituted exponent of P. R. Baptist principle most disingenuously insisting, that the whole truth and counsel of God is after the manner and according to the commandment of the Lord Jesus Christ and his Apostles, both to saint and sinner indiscriminately preached. (p. 198.) Accepting therefore this truly unprecedented statement exactly as by its unscrupulous author it has been given, and laying it side by side with his own express doctrinal teaching, to wit, *that the Lord Jesus Christ died without evangelical purpose toward the non-elect*, I here to every candid mind see fit to suggest the thought: to wit,—Since with one breath the wilfully untruthful party before us, under full knowledge that it is not the case, boldly affirms that in the P. R. Baptist Churches the gospel is according to the commandment of the Lord Jesus and his Apostles indiscriminately preached,—and since with the very next breath

he gives us to understand, that except only in the case of the elect there is absolutely no vestige of scriptural ground *for* such preaching,—therefore, should not this gratuitous propounder of palpable contradictions for once condescend to say, *upon what other ground the ministers of his Churches proceed*, when according to the commission of the Lord Jesus Christ and his Apostles, they freely and indiscriminately preach the gospel to the non-elect masses? Let this highly intelligent but altogether incomprehensible public instructor, if haply his self-importance may for once deign thus much, by the rendering of a purely scriptural answer to this most pertinent demand, vouchsafe to relieve from the charge of folly all those ministerial brethren whom he has impeached. But if for that indiscriminate preaching which he has boldly imputed to them, he be unable to produce another and an all-sufficient ground, then, nothing can be plainer than the fact, that *by* his gratuitous imputation he has to the uttermost covered with ridicule every minister, every Church throughout the entire denomination. For the humbling charge which he makes against them is this: that notwithstanding the absence of sign, shadow, or vestige of a righteous ground on which to preach the gospel indiscriminately to all, these ministers have been guilty of the folly of testifying, these Churches guilty of the unfaithfulness of countenancing, that which at first glance the doctrinal opinion which they espouse, to wit, “*that Christ died ONLY with purpose towards the elect*,” proves to be a manifest falsehood. But since this matter of fraternal slander is not mine, but that exclusively of the several ministers and Churches thus mendaciously impeached, I gladly leave it in their own hands and pass on.

Having then, first from his master’s mouth—secondly, from his own—and thirdly, from the universal consciousness of every member of the P. R. Baptist Churches beside—convicted this radically incompetent theologian of falsehood, I next take leave to convict him from the Article immediately foregoing; I mean, that published in the “Gospel Standard” in 1871. Is it not in that Article (upon the doctrinal leprosy of which I have not failed to lay manifesting finger) thus plainly written?—“We complain that there is little doing among us, in the way especially of conversion. Now, then, is the time to say that the preaching has all been defective. Sinners should not only be addressed and warned *but told to repent, believe*, and perform spiritual and saving acts.” (p. 514.) Is it not again in the same place written,—“Now then, brethren, if *addresses to unconverted men*, in which they are told to perform saving spiritual acts (*he means, told to repent and believe on Christ*) are right, throw both our Review and the book reviewed into the fire; both are wrong.” (p. 515).

Even thus in his instruction to the Churches, flats forth the author of the Article of 1871. But in direct opposition to that substantially blasphemous Article, thus saith the Bible,—“Now after that John was put in prison, Jesus came into Galilee preaching the gospel of the kingdom of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled and the kingdom of God is at hand : REPENT YE, AND BELIEVE THE GOSPEL.” (Mark i. 14, 15.) In full view of this inspired and most unequivocal testimony, it will, nay ! absolutely and of necessity it *must* be admitted, that the preaching of repentance and faith to men indiscriminately was certainly part, yea ! a very large and remarkable part, of that which goes to constitute the whole counsel of God. With the eye of his mind fixed upon it, let the reader next call to remembrance the false statement of the writer with whose Christian integrity I here war : for he says, that the whole truth and counsel of God IS in the P. R. Baptist Churches proclaimed to the unconverted ; and that to affirm the reverse, is to libel these ecclesiastical witnesses. Well then, if this writer be not guilty of a deliberate, a calmly premeditated falsehood, we are bound to conclude, that Christ-fashion, it is by the several ministers of these Churches preached home to the hearts and consciences of sinners,—“REPENT YE, AND BELIEVE THE GOSPEL.” For this is *one grand part* of the whole truth and counsel of God ; and in order to a free proclamation of *the whole*, no part, but certainly not *so immense a part*, must on any pretence whatever be omitted. The question therefore arises, *Is repentance toward God, and faith in Christ for the remission of sin*, preached home to the hearts and consciences of careless sinners in these Churches ? We might from the bold, unhesitating assertion of the mendacious writer before us, feel very much disposed to believe that such really is the testimony maintained in the P. R. Baptist Churches. Yet strange to say, the writer of the former Article in the “Gospel Standard,” does, as I have clearly shewn, without ruth or ceremony—nay ! with no inconsiderable amount of blasphemy—repudiate on behalf of his Churches all such preaching ; not only denouncing it to be wrong, but with a degree of egotism, an inordinateness of self-importance truly ludicrous, bidding us as a kind of punishment should we in defence of Jehovah’s revealed truth presume to dissent, burn both his precious “Review,” and the book of his master’s letters. If then the very righteous scribe of the Article of 1871 be right—have truly stated the fact as that fact is found in the P. R. Baptist Churches—then, the other highly principled scribe of the Article of 1873, is in the presence of all his Churches clearly manifested to be A LIAR. And contrariwise, supposing for a single moment the

highly principled scribe of the Article of 1873 to be true man and no liar, then, it is absolutely certain, that the other very righteous scribe of the Article of 1871, is in the presence of all his Churches with equal plainness demonstrated to be THE LIAR. As for myself, I do not count it worth my while to decide for the Churches which of the two is the transgressor: in a matter so purely, so utterly disgraceful, I gladly concede them the right, of sole, unparticipated judgment.

By the manifold evidences with which the preceding pages are burdened—their every line and syllable absolutely saturated—I have again and again convicted the author of the Article which I am examining, of having for his own evil purpose both printed and published deliberately planned falsehood. And now, lastly, by it may be the most remarkable, but at least the most vividly illustrative evidence of all, I proceed yet further to convict him.

It is a fact well known to all the members and congregation of the leading sanctuary of the "GOSPEL STANDARD CHURCHES," the Church worshipping in Gower Street, London, that on Sunday the 20th of December, in the year just past, 1874, one of their favourite preachers, the Rev. C. Hemington, did from the pulpit publicly signify his intention to carry out that duty which he knew to be utterly neglected in these Churches, to wit, of scripturally preaching to the unregenerate—or to sinners: a duty, mark, which *so early as the spring of 1871, or more than three years and a half previously*, not merely by letter, but also by word of mouth, he had again and again to myself, and at least to one deacon of the Church in question, solemnly admitted (according to the *intuitive conviction, the latent but real belief of his heart*) to be THE LORD'S UNDENIABLE WILL. But in making to the Church in Gower Street this late-come announcement, be it specially observed, that the Rev. labourer found it absolutely necessary to excuse to his audience this extraordinary intention, by giving them to understand, "that in carrying out in future his new-born determination, he humbly hoped that he should be enabled to do it in such a manner, as not in anywise to sacrifice or compromise the doctrines of grace." Now I ask every ingenuous mind,—What have we here? Is it not this? First, a startling (startling I mean to a P. R. Baptist Church) announcement made from the pulpit by Mr. Hemington: secondly, because of the highly startling nature of that announcement, a consciousness by the party making it, that it needed to be supplemented and softened down by apology: thirdly, that public announcement thus accompanied by apology, coming forth as an extremely late atonement to the wisdom, will, and sovereign right of Jehovah, after at least *three years and a half* of deliberate, of most conscious neg-

lect : and fourthly, as a cause of that conscious, that deliberate neglect throughout the long period named, *the fear, the pusillanimous dread*, which through that storm of persecution aroused by my own vigorous defence of the divine will, had from the sanctuary of Gower Street, in London, extended to every part and province of the land ? Such the several facts of THAT CASE, to the singularity of which I have now made appeal. What then from these facts is the conclusion ? I answer, This. That not only up to Sunday the 20th day of December 1874 was the **WHOLE TRUTH AND COUNSEL OF GOD** (as asserted by the mendacious scribe whose duplicity I unmask) **NOT PREACHED** in the Gower Street sanctuary, but that even to make announcement of a yet future determination *in the neglected part* to obey Jehovah, was a most precarious venture : indeed, so precarious, as to involve at the hand of the preacher making it, positive necessity that he should excuse, soften, palliate the determination announced, by elaborate and degrading apology. How altogether superabounding then, nay ! how absolutely overwhelming the evidence, that not only up to the time above recorded *was the whole truth and counsel of God NOT declared in the P. R. Baptist Churches*, but that by the great body of their members it was assumed to be an acceptable act, yea ! doing God service, to repudiate and laugh to scorn a very large, a deeply momentous part of His revealed will. But in open defiance of this almost universally prevailing opinion, and in utter disregard of the peculiar, the cherished boast of these Churches, that pre-eminently conscientious scribe of the "Gospel Standard" whom I arraign, with a regard for probity upon which I will in nowise trust myself to comment, does unhesitatingly—nay ! with the most barefaced audacity—the most knavish, most braggart effrontery assert—that faithful declaration of the whole truth and counsel of God, both *is* and *ever has been* the rule of that ministry, chosen and exalted by his Baptist brethren : and that he who in this respect would dispute their claim, necessarily renders himself a gratuitous libeller.

Now mark. If indeed the stout-hearted affirmation of this righteous witness of the "Gospel Standard" were true, were no lie ; that is, if as its author most falsely affirms, the proclamation of the whole truth and counsel of God *had ever been* the rule of the ministry in the P. R. Baptist Churches, then, what need I ask for the Rev. C. Hemington on the 20th day of December in particular, and not earlier than the close of the year of grace 1874, to announce that in the momentous duty of preaching home to the hearts and consciences of **THE UNREGENERATE**, he had at length fully determined to begin—*was on the very eve*

of doing that, which he and his mates had been altogether unaccustomed to presume? And again, If that rule of the ministry which by our righteous scribe has been claimed and re-claimed on behalf of his Churches had been true, then, why in making his altogether superfluous announcement in Gower Street does Mr. Hemington deem the ground beneath his feet so precarious, as to feel an absolute necessity of proceeding with his matter by the way of apology? Surely if these Churches, their membered and non-membered adherents had been of old, even from the earliest quite used to hear,—altogether familiar with the report of that part of the truth and counsel of God which relates to unconverted sinners, then, both Mr. Hemington's formal announcement and elaborate but degrading apology were altogether unnecessary; nay! were tantamount to an absolute impertinence. Whether therefore this Rev. party have indeed grossly stultified himself, and made light of his audience and their integrity, or whether the author of the Article with which I here deal have DELIBERATELY LIED, I think it not worth my while to decide. I leave between the whole assembly of the Church worshipping in the sanctuary of Gower Street, and the Rev. labourer in question, the work of framing a true and consistent solution.

Having dwelt sufficiently on the mendacious character of the doctrinal Articles, by trusty scribes concocted, candid editors published, in that pseudo-incorruptible religious periodical called the "Gospel Standard," I proceed ere closing these pages to notice a highly irreverent contradiction of the Son of God, in which (following hard after the writer of the Article of 1871) this author would seem absolutely to triumph.

With express intention to deny that most august of divine truths, the all-sufficiency of the grand Work of Christ to sustain God's evangelical purpose in the non-elect, and with a degree of insolence in precise ratio with his sublime ignorance, this great doctrinal authority proceeds to fiat forth his odious blasphemy as follows. "NOW WE SAY, in answer to this notion, which is nothing but A BRAT of men's brains," (*he here speaks of the excellent truth that the Lord Jesus Christ discerned in Himself and His Work an ample ground for the progress of the Father's purpose in the non-elect*), "that the infiniteness of the death of Christ, and what it was capable of accomplishing had God willed it, is not the question. The question is, Was the death of Christ vicarious—substitutional? Did he stand as a Surety in the law-place and stead of those for whom he died? Did he actually take their sins by imputation, and make a full satisfaction to God by his complete atonement on the cross?" (p. 201.) This radically unscriptural passage in its first clause.—clause as remarkable for its

odious vulgarity as its unadulterated and concentrated blasphemy—boldly rejects the divinely attested truth of the all-sufficiency inherent in Christ's Work; affirming of that most exalted of divine dogmas, that it is "*nothing but a brat of men's brains.*" a plebeian mode of speech, which with design to deride as an invention of man, and as much as possible degrade the august doctrine in question, has by this pitiable plagiarist been adopted. To the ribald jest of the profane joker, therefore, I first of all as a preliminary measure oppose the general proposition, THAT NO BLASPHEMING OF THE BLASPHEMER IS OF THE LEAST FORCE TO RENDER INSUBSTANTIAL THE GLORIOUS SUBSTANCE OF PLAINLY REVEALED TRUTH. If then in the aboundings of his vanity this greatly presumptuous writer foolishly imagine, that the hardness of his personal blaspheming is verily compensatory for his lack of argument—the impertinence of his dogmatism a sufficient atonement for his rank falsehood and gratuitous deceit—then, I beg as a pure act of charity to give the unhappy man to understand, that he is self-deceived: that much egotism doth make him mad. Or if, as it might appear, he conclude, that the more insolent and offensive his demeanour, more rampant and ridiculous his pride, the more effectually it serves to extinguish the glory of Christ in the Scriptures, then, here again I humbly crave leave to inform him, that the several evil spirits to which he has become subordinated, have too successfully by far betrayed him to the inexorable curse of Destiny—the righteous doom of the scorner and knave; to wit, of bowing before, and too obsequiously worshipping, the molten calf of his own fallen image. Had this writer been so much less than infinitely lofty, as to deign to exhibit the proofs of his opinions, I doubt not that every sensible, or at least every sanctified member in the Churches of Christ would have been willing respectfully to weigh his arguments and sift by the Scriptures his evidences. But when the absurdly self-important creature supposes, that serious and thoughtful natures, hearts that desire the truth, and the whole truth of God, to the end that that Most Holy may be magnified; the sister end, that in His supremacy, His most venerable authority, He may as is meet be respected; when I say this groundlessly self-complacent personage presumes to suppose, that *such* Christian spirits are on the exclusive warrant of his "NOW WE SAY," to suffer the unproved and unprovable vociferations of a knave and deliberate fabricator of falsehood,—I tell the poor man that the joke becomes by an infinite degree too exquisite to tolerate. Even Christian men, if by any means these should happen to possess discernment or mind, will scarcely be able to evade the inquiry, "*Is he who in the pride of his heart is so manifestly A GOD UNTO*"

HIMSELF, *become on his own exclusive warrant*, A GOD ALSO UNTO US?'

Having premised thus much, I proceed more particularly to handle the substance of this reprehensible, nay! (as to matter considered), absolutely blasphemous extract. With regard then to that vulgarly contemptuous fiat which distinguishes it, and which with express design to vilify the divine wisdom has been adopted, to wit, that that most glorious of revealed truths, the all-sufficiency of the sacrifice of Christ to constitute a just ground for Jehovah's purpose in the non-elect, "*is nothing but a brat of men's brains*," will the truly elegant author for once permit me to bring to the notice of His Loftiness, that if indeed it be the brat of any man's brains, (*vulgarism which reduced to plain language signifies a palpable lie*), then the human brain responsible for it—brain alone from which it emanated—is that which without intervention of the law of natural generation, was by the immediate wisdom of the Father, the sin-separating power of the Holy Ghost, divinely fashioned in the womb of the Virgin Mary; and the undoubted proprietor of which, we are accustomed to designate the Eternal Son of God; or in other words, the Lord Jesus Christ—Immanuel—the Incarnate Deity; He in whom dwelt the fulness of the Godhead bodily. That infinitely sublime truth—truth of His own all-sufficiency in equity to sustain the whole evangelical purpose of God; truth which for lack of light, lack of knowledge, lack of authority, no other man claiming to be a Christian, or at least no uninspired Christian might ever by force of brain have ventured to beget; but which this utterly indecorous, this equally false writer has dared to call "*a brat of men's brains*;" He—Christ—the Messiah of God—*has* seen fit to beget, has also brought to the birth, yea! has from that unfathomable profound, the never-erring wisdom of HIS brain, very safely delivered. Hear it—ye righteous souls all; for thus from the light of His infallible omniscience saith JEHOVAH TSIDKENU—THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS. "Though through the illimitable virtue of the Cross—virtue which for the out-carrying of every part of the high purpose of the Godhead has with infinite discrimination by the Father been applied—there be, to the glorification of His equity, abounding, nay! infinite sufficiency in me *to bestow even upon the non-elect eternal life*; yea! though I detect in myself this superabounding, this divinely infinite, this gloriously illimitable all-sufficiency, and on the strength of it declare that competency which is in me to confer the high blessing in question; yet non-elect men—even those who according to the secret purpose of my Father were from *eternity* absolutely bidden—*will not come to me THAT THEY MIGHT*

(*that is, by Me*) HAVE LIFE." So much for the faithful enunciation of Christ. But in utter disregard of this exalted, this sublime scriptural testimony, nay! in direct contradiction and contempt thereof, behold now the infamous birthling begotten by the presumptuous brain of Immanuel's self-infatuated calumniator. For thus saith the scribe—whether hireling or voluntary of the "Gospel Standard" I presume not to guess—"NOW WE SAY *to this notion*, (Christ's perception in Himself of an infinite sufficiency) *that it is nothing but a brat of men's brains.*" Thus much on the part of Immanuel's contemptible contradictor. Since therefore this scribe—hireling or voluntary of the "Gospel Standard"—as the self-constituted instructor of the P. R. Baptist Churches contumaciously asserts one thing; and the Eternal Son of the ever-blessed Father in all the calm, deep, dignified solemnity which belongs a statement having birth from the Godhead, steadfastly affirms the reverse; it remains, or at least here on earth remains for the Church of God to decide, which of the two thus stoutly making averment is of a verity THE LIAR. Unless it can certainly be shewn, that direct counter-statements harmonize, that manifest contradictions agree, then, it abides a fact for ever, that both cannot be *true witnesses*. He therefore of the two, that from the disingenuous throes of a false and treacherous brain hath begotten and given birth to a *real brat*, let him be—THE LIAR; the foul thing of his gratuitous begetting—THE LIE. That it may thus transpire, I lay it home to the heart and conscience of every regenerate member of the P. R. Baptist Churches, (for with Antinomian spirits, the men who love darkness rather than light, I have no argument), I say I lay it home to every such heart and conscience as follows. It is incumbent on you, all ye that fear the Lord, for the glory of His truth, His wisdom, and His holy name, that according to the light of that imperative command from Heaven,—“LET GOD BE TRUE, AND EVERY MAN A LIAR,”—ye *do* between the weighty asseveration of the Son of God and its insolent denial by this proud scribe of the “Gospel Standard,” judge righteous judgment. And at this point, take note, that the wisdom of the Holy Ghost by the mouth of Peter does most forcibly recur: to wit, Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken to the blasphemy of this Christ-contradictor more than unto God, JUDGE YE.”

But to proceed. Let the intelligent reader yet further mark, that with a dogmatism only equalled by the depths of his ignorance, this theologian of the borrowed robe asserts,—*Now WE say*, in answer to this notion, which is nothing but a brat of men's brains, that the infiniteness of the death of Christ, and *what it was* capable of accomplishing, had God so willed it, is

not the question. The question is, Was the death of Christ vicarious—substitutional? Did he stand as a Surety in *the law place* and stead of those for whom he died? Such the averment, at second hand, of this highly superficial contributor to the “Gospel Standard.” I thank God for here granting me occasion—and take advantage of the opportunity thus afforded—in the most public, most positive manner, to contradict the manifestly absurd position of this theorizer. I tell him, and every P. R. Baptist Church that accepts his stupid and false fiat, that what he affirms to be the question, is NOT *the question*: moreover, though he should augment his dogmatism a millionfold, he will never succeed in making it to be the question. Considered apart from the *theologically incorrect phrase* “LAW-PLACE,” and the *impossible idea connecting therewith*, that it is ONE HALF OF THE QUESTION, I am prepared most frankly to admit: but that one half, or the fragment of a matter, constitutes the entirety of that matter, I take occasion most emphatically to deny. To receive any such blunder, I should need a confusion of thought, a superficiality of discernment, equal at least to that which characterizes this inordinately self-complacent person. But since through a constitution of mind differing in some respects from that which so pre-eminently characterizes him, I am not one, the pleasant hypothesis of whom is, that the ignorance of my own heart forms an admirable substitute for the infallibility of revealed truth; consequently not given to deal in rash, unproved, and altogether unprovable assertion; therefore, for elaborate evidence upon this head, I have the pleasure to refer the inquirer to chapters IV and V of that portion of this Work, which constitutes the “Argument for the case of Jehovah.” On the strength of *such* absolutely irrefutable evidence do I to the uttermost meet the assertion—DOGMATICAL AS SUPERFICIAL—which by this pseudo-theologian has been propounded: to wit, that that only which *he* in his blindness is pleased to pronounce to be the question, IS the question: I meet it I say with a flat negative and affirm—that IT IS NOT. And contrary to this self-infatuated party—whoever *he* be—on the strength of those chapters to which reference has been made I aver, and for ever lay it down, that the real question, the whole question, the scripturally demonstrable question in its entirety, is as follows: viz.,—Was the grand Work of Christ by the arbitrary appointment, acceptance, and infinitely wise application of the Lawgiver, rendered a vicarious or substitutional offering on behalf of the elect; hence for *them* a full, a finished, a law-magnifying redemption,—including all gifts of grace in time, all honour and glory in eternity? while by the same rule, that is, through the same arbitrary appointment, &c.

ceptance, and infinitely wise application of the immaculate Lawgiver, was the very same Work of Christ rendered efficacious, and has it of necessity become available *for the carrying out of all those high and holy ends in connection with the non-elect*, which in eternal council with the Son and the Holy Spirit, the Lawgiver and those August Hypostases of the Godhead, themselves saw fit to determine?

Such the sublime question—IN FULL. By its greatly superior magnitude to those dimensions which, borrowing his wisdom from others, has by the party whose vain fiat I annul been too dogmatically, too pretentiously prescribed for it, the procedure peculiar to all such judges of Jehovah, to wit, of establishing their antisciptural opinions by deliberately ignoring an entire half of the divine counsel, is once more very strikingly made manifest. Let him that is equal to the task, apply the veil. And it is, as I have elsewhere demonstrated, worse than vain under plea of upholding the strict substitution of the Work of Christ on behalf of the elect, to have recourse to that most absurd of theological conceits, “THE LAW-PLACE;” for the strict legal substitution of Christ on behalf of the elect, stands immovable upon its own proper basis; stands, I say, infinitely more firm without aid of the above impossible dogma, than ever through force of such myth it can be made to stand. Hence needs no indemonstrable buttressing, by application to it of such outrageous absurdity. For full, or at least amply convincing exposition of which fact, I refer every intelligent reader to the whole body of argument recorded between pp. 204 and 210 of this Treatise.

Having now to the self-confident writer of the Article under consideration set forth the question of the grand Work of Christ IN FULL, next and finally, with design to rivet upon the minds of himself and doctrinal associates true conviction, do I, as in the presence of that God whom so specially it concerns thrust home upon them the naked fact, to wit,—That if in contempt of the overwhelming mass of evidence here adduced, they still persist in denying the evangelical purpose of God in the non-elect, still insist on dishonouring that Grand Work through which such evangelical purpose is sustained, then, since in every theological code, the Lord in all by that code to Himself imputed has a right to be justified, there does infallibly or of absolute necessity arise to them obligation, that in respect of the five following scripturally suggested inquiries, they exhibit trustworthy or divinely substantiated answers. First,—What by the coessential Son of God is assumed when He says, that long prior to the verbal call of the non-elect to that gospel feast at which through grace the

elect sit down, those non-elect parties had indeed by the Eternal Father been VIRTUALLY BIDDEN? Secondly,—What that true and equitable ground really is on which, in face of His own violated law, and apart from the grand Work of Christ, the immaculately pure, unimpeachably just Jehovah, can unreservedly send forth *to sinners* the verbal call of His gospel of salvation: as it is written, “*For many ARE CALLED (that is, by the word of the gospel) but few ARE CHOSEN*”? Thirdly,—How it comes to pass, that when for the non-elect there is positively *no* gospel, nor indeed a vestige of just ground upon which for them there *might* be a gospel, the Lord because of their *not believing for salvation* upon His Son, can in a judicial capacity sternly censure them, and yet before His angels be justified? Fourthly,—By virtue of what dispositional quality of the Divine Nature, (*malice the most fell excepted*), does the Eternal Ruler avail himself of his unchallengeable supremacy to deceive and mock by calling to believe in a gospel which is *no gospel*, and condemn to a deeper damnation for not trusting in that which is a *nonentity*, those non-elect victims with whom (as His own Scriptures plainly avouch) He *does* thus most assuredly deal? And Fifthly,—Why when according to His own testimony and judgment, truth, transparency, rectitude, are at all times more simple, more comely, more honourable than fraud, guile, falsehood, He himself, without even the bare plea of necessity for such procedure, has seen fit to decree and execute that, which in any of his intelligent creatures would, unquestionably, by Himself have been adjudged eternally damning crime; to wit, the wrong of cramming a Record publicly declared to be pure, infallible, true, that is, the Holy Bible, *brimful of lies and detestable deceivings*? Even thus to that extremely veracious scribe of the “Gospel Standard” whom I here condemn—every individual moreover of his sympathizing, rationalistically wise but antisciptural peers—DO I ETERNALLY SEAL THEIR IRREMEDIAL DILEMMA.

IT IS DONE! That illustrious work which by the Lord had been appointed me—work of raising up from the dust and exalting His hoof-trampled Word—work of vindicating against the inventions of a host of gratuitous theorists His wisdom, will, and sovereign right—is at length to the very uttermost accomplished: and the record of His witness before the throne. I may now without a solitary upbraiding of conscience, a single reproach of Him whose high battle I have fought, cast aside trusty buckler and spear. The eight hundred of the erring judges is overthrown—the victory won—the right hand of the Lord is exalted. What I have here written is writ, not for Time, but for Eternity. In full view of which fact, I charge it home upon

the hearts and consciences of all spiritual members of the High Calvinistic Baptist Churches, that each regenerate man in particular—the entire sanctified body in the aggregate—do faithfully and without compromise insist, that through unremitting exhibition in their midst of those divine truths which bear specially upon the non-elect, **THE WHOLE WILL AND COUNSEL OF JEHOVAH BE RESPECTED.** Thus much to the remnant of grace—the truly spiritual in Christ Jesus. But to the gainsayers—those who knowingly and persistently trample down divine truth—the hundred thousand in defiance of the slander and injuriousness of whom I have (single-handed and solitary albeit) sternly vindicated the right and sceptre of Jehovah—do I publicly, yea! in the presence of all their Churches most solemnly certify it, **THAT FOR THE SURE CONFOUNDING IN THE GREAT AND FEARFUL DAY OF THEIR GUILLE,—HERE—OFFICIALLY—STRIKING OFF AS GOD'S WITNESS AGAINST THEM THE VERY DUST OF MY FEET—I APPEAL TO THE GREAT SPIRITUAL CÆSAR.**

THE END.

BY THE AUTHOR.

"THE STAR OF PROPHECY : OR, FIRST-BORN OF SHINAR."

A Poem in Three Cantos : illustrative of the inestimable value of the Revealed Word, and the invincible power with which for the salvation of the Church of Christ, the Holy Spirit will apply it.

NISBET AND Co., 21, Berners Street, London ; and J. C. PEMBREY, 159, Abbey Place, Oxford. Price 2s. 6d.

"THE LAST REGRET : OR, THE POWER OF DIVINE REGENERATION."

An Experimental Poem in Two Cantos : being, A Witness against "Essays and Reviews."

GARDINER AND SON, 20, Princes Street, Cavendish Square, London.
Price 1s. 6d.

"THE SEVERITY OF DIVINE DISCIPLINE : EXPERIMENTALLY TRACED FROM THE CASE OF DAVID."

. A Meditation.

HOULSTON AND SONS, Paternoster Buildings, London. Pages 25. Price 2d.

"THE FOUNTAIN OF ISRAEL : OR, JEHOVAH'S SOVEREIGN ORDINATIONS IN ZION."

A Meditation.

HOULSTON AND SONS. Pages 50. Price 4d.

"THE ARROW OF THE LORD'S DELIVERANCE : OR, DIVINE LIGHT FOR THE BROKEN IN HEART."

. A Meditation.

HOULSTON AND SONS. Pages 52. Price 4d.

"SULĀSUT TŪL KŪTOOB," ("THE THREE BOOKS").

A Refutation of the Korān and the Religion called Islam.

Dekhāni Hindēe and English Editions, The Church Missionary Society's Mahommedan School, Madras : Urdu Edition, The Book and Tract Societies of Lahore and Allahabad, and American Mission Press, Louisiana.









